The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XXXIII • DECEMBER, 1947 • NUMBER 4

LITERATURE AS AN ENTERPRISE IN COMMUNICATION

WILBUR SAMUEL HOWELL*

Mais si les vrais orateurs sont poètes, il me semble aussi que les poètes sont orateurs; car la poésie est propre à persuader.
—Fénelon, *Dialogues sur l'Éloquence*

MY purpose in this essay is to examine the relation of the artistic enterprise to the communicative enterprise, in an effort to find what bearing the former has upon communication and social action. Enlightened social action may well be considered the necessary condition of our survival as human beings. Communication is without question the great enterprise by which enlightened social action is determined. This enterprise consists in the transfer of truth and opinion from one person to another through the channels provided by our educational institutions, our books, periodicals, newspapers, radios, and movies, our political campaigns and legislative processes, our pulpits, our courts, our mediation boards, our conventions of scientists and scholars. I propose to inquire whether or not the artistic enterprise is to be considered a part of this enterprise of communication; and if so, whether it is therefore in danger of losing its identity and of being confused with what we popularly regard as the more practical and more pedestrian arts of the orator, the propagandist, and the popularizer of knowledge.

*Associate Professor of Public Speaking, Princeton University.

I

This inquiry can hardly be ignored, so important has it become in the twentieth century. The status of the fine arts has been vigorously debated throughout the course of recorded history, but at no time has this debate been more acrimonious than it is at present. Oppressed by the fear that the artistic enterprise may become a mere tool of the party in power, and may be forced to parrot the insidious and soul-destroying ideologies that issue from the ministry of propaganda, some recent critics have taken the position that the fine arts are not a means of communication and persuasion. This school of criticism identifies the fine arts with pleasure rather than instruction, with beauty rather than utility, with imagination and taste rather than reason and judgment, and with aesthetic needs rather than practical daily necessities. Meanwhile, other critics, recognizing the persuasive value of the work of art, have said in effect that art is nothing but propaganda; and that, when artists deliberately assert the contrary, they are influenced, not by the facts of artistic effect, but by their class-conscious aversion to standards by which some of them would be judged failures, or by their snobbish unwillingness to renounce their long associations with

the rich and the aristocratic. The truth seems to lie somewhere between these two rival positions, once each has been stripped of the eulogistic or vituperative language in which it is usually expressed. The truth seems in short to be that a genuine work of art and a genuine specimen of propaganda are not alike in all respects, but that each has nevertheless a social purpose that can be connected with the elaborate process by which human beings adjust themselves to each other and to their environment in the eternal quest for security and survival.

Verbal utterances, spoken or written, occupy a central position among the products of the communicative enterprise, and a no less central position among the products of the artistic enterprise. The specialists in propaganda, oratory, and popularization necessarily use words in disseminating information and in seeking to influence the attitudes of great masses of men, although pictures and other devices are important parts of the machinery of communication. The verbal utterances used by these specialists have many names, but as a matter of convenience they may all be called rhetorical. The poet, the dramatist, and the novelist use the same medium of words, now and then in combination with pictures, musical notes, painting, dances, and the like. Verbal utterances created by these men and women—by artists, as distinguished from rhetoricians—may all be called poetical. How words behave in the rhetorical and the poetical enterprises would seem to be an inquiry that might lead to a possible clarification of the differences between propaganda and art. It is this inquiry which will occupy us here.

In the ensuing discussion I shall consider three main propositions. The first is that the poetical utterance belongs to the enterprise of communication by virtue of the fact that it does actually convey to readers a something that they did not have before. What this something is has been variously described. To some it is a feeling, an attitude, a mood; to others, a meaning or a complex of meanings; to others, an idea, an ideology, a truth; to others, an insight, an intuition, an imaginative view of the world. The history of criticism abounds in terms to be applied to what it is that a poetic utterance gives its readers, but there has never been a movement in criticism that holds to the notion that poetry is devoid of all power to give anything to anybody. Nevertheless, as I mentioned earlier, attempts have been made to say that the poetical utterance is not primarily communicative, and thus my first proposition requires some discussion. My second proposition is that the poetical utterance differs from the rhetorical utterance by virtue of the fact that the words used in the latter refer directly to states of reality, and that the words used in the former refer directly to things that stand by deputy for states of reality. These things that stand by deputy for other things I shall call symbols. Symbolism is characteristic of poetical representation; it is not the primary characteristic of rhetoric, as I shall endeavor to explain later. My third proposition is that the poetical, like the rhetorical, utterance persuades those who come in contact with it, and thus affects social action. Some will of course have an initial impulse to feel that the term "persuasive" cannot with propriety be applied to poetry; but I hope to show that it can, and I hope to suggest that, when it is placed there, it will give poetry no inferiority of status in human affairs, but on the contrary a status that poetry ought not willingly to disavow.

II

Critics who detach poetry from the enterprise of communication usually base their thinking upon the assumption that the absence of a desire to communicate is what gives the poetical utterance its unique characteristics, and that the presence of this desire makes any utterance rhetorical. They argue that the personal lyric is the purest form of poetry, and that the other types of literature—the narrative, the tragedy, the comedy, the satire—are progressively less pure as they manifest an increasing intention to reach and impress an audience; whereas in oratory and propaganda, where the communicative intention of an author is developed to its farthest extent, poetical qualities vanish altogether. But these critics do not as a rule deny that the lyric poem has the capacity to transfer some mood or attitude from the poet to his readers. What they do deny is that the lyric is produced for the sake of the impression it is to make. They say that it must exhibit within itself no evidence of a communicative purpose—that it must be created for the sake of expression, not impression. Since expression is considered by them to be a private need of the poet, of no primary concern to the adjoining populace, their dialectic reduces the social function of the lyric to a secondary, almost to an accidental, status.

This view of poetry and rhetoric has present-day adherents.[1] I should like to examine it, however, not in its more recent formulations, but in the version that its adherents cite as one of their chief sources. That version is found in John Stuart Mill's "Thoughts on Poetry and Its Varieties," published originally in *The Monthly Repository* in 1833. Early in that essay, Mill distinguishes science from poetry by saying that "the one addresses itself to the belief, the other to the feelings." This differentiation prepares the way for his discussion of the line of division between the oration and the poem. As he knew, oratory had traditionally been regarded as having to do both with belief and feeling. Thus it seemed to him to be in a position where it could claim affiliations with science and with poetry. In an effort to show how the oration and the poem could alike address the feelings, and yet remain distinct from each other, Mill remarks that the former bears within itself visible evidences of its author's awareness of his intention to communicate, whereas the latter does not.

> Poetry and eloquence [he states] are both alike the expression or utterance of feeling. But if we may be excused the antithesis, we should say that eloquence is *heard*, poetry is *over*heard. Eloquence supposes an audience; the peculiarity of poetry appears to us to lie in the poet's utter unconsciousness of a listener. Poetry is feeling confessing itself to itself, in moments of solitude, and embodying itself in symbols which are the nearest possible representations of the feeling in the exact shape in which it exists in the poet's mind. Eloquence is feeling pouring itself out to other minds, courting their sympathy, or endeavouring to influence their belief or move them to passion or to action.[2]

Mill immediately adds that "all poetry [i.e., all lyric poetry] is of the nature of soliloquy." Not wishing, however, to imply that poets are eccentrics who talk aloud to themselves and do not know of the other means of publication, he

[1] See for example, Hudson, H. H., "Rhetoric and Poetry," THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION, X (April, 1924), 143-154; and, by the same author, "The Field of Rhetoric," *Ibid.*, IX (April, 1923), 167-180. For fragments and suggestions of this view, see Marchbanks' speech to Proserpine in Bernard Shaw's *Candida*, Act II, in *Plays: Pleasant and Unpleasant* (1906), II, 118; and Smith, B. L., Lasswell, H. D., and Casey, R. D., *Propaganda, Communication, and Public Opinion* (Princeton, 1946), pp. 1-2.

[2] I cite the text as it appears in Mill, J. S., *Dissertations and Discussions* (London, 1859), I, 71. The quotations that follow are from pp. 71 and 72.

goes on to show that, while they may print for others what they have said to themselves, no trace of consciousness that any eyes are upon them "must be visible in the work itself." The poet's "act of utterance," continues Mill, must be "itself the end"; when it becomes the means to an end, "when the expression of his emotions, or of his thoughts tinged by his emotions, is tinged also . . . by that desire of making an impression upon another mind, then it ceases to be poetry, and becomes eloquence."

In criticism of Mill's view it must be emphasized that a consciousness of the impulse to communicate cannot be affirmed or denied to exist in the poet's mind at the moment of poetic creation without assuming that we know for a fact what is in effect only a speculation on our part. If we cannot be sure that we actually see what happens in the poet's mind when he is producing a poem, if we can be sure only that the happenings in that mind bear an analogy to normal mental experience, and are simply intenser configurations of that normal experience, then we could not go so far as to say that an impulse to communicate is totally absent from the poet's consciousness at the instant when an impulse to express something is present there. Mill's later hypothesis, which he explains at some length in the closing pages of his essay, is that the poetic nature differs fundamentally from the scientific or philosophical nature. Differences there are, to be sure, as one person's heart action differs from another's. But it seems unwise to describe them in such a way as to eliminate from the poet's consciousness at a given moment a communicative impulse that, for all we know, is there present in some complex association with the expressive impulse.

A further weakness in Mill's position is apparent if we try to prove that the lyric utterance contains no evidence of its author's intention to communicate. The fact that words are the chief medium of human intercourse, and that the laws of grammar, logic, and rhetoric have shaped language so as to render it more communicative than a lawless medium would be, gives any utterance, poetical or rhetorical, predominantly communicative traits. In his *Counter-Statement,* Mr. Kenneth Burke has shown that these traits are everywhere apparent in the structural arrangements of poetry, in a chain of events arranged, for example, in the order of climax; and that these arrangements always betray the poet's communicative intention. Burke argues, indeed, that since the poetic utterance is designed to produce effects upon an audience, and since rhetoric aims at the same goal, effective literature can be nothing else but rhetoric.[3] This is an extreme position. It suggests that there is no major difference between the oration and the poem; by implication it denies the possibility of difference between producing effects upon an audience by direct statements about reality and producing effects upon an audience by deputies or symbols of reality. But it nevertheless has value in calling attention to the communicative function of poetry, and to the objective evidences of this function in any poem's structure. If we preferred the alternative view of Mill, we would find it hard to point out in a poem any evidences that it was purely expressive. Sooner or later we would have to admit that Mill's view allows poetry to be merely communicative for the sake of expression as its purer aim, and requires rhetoric to be only communicative for the sake of communication as its entire aim. Such

[3] *Counter-Statement* (1931), pp. 265-266.

an admission would make it clear that, if the distinction between poetry and rhetoric can only be expressed in terms of the difference between the soliloquy and the direct address, then it is not a very satisfactory distinction. A better one, indeed, is suggested by Mill's surprisingly incidental statement that the poetic utterance achieves its uniqueness by "embodying itself in symbols which are the nearest possible representations of the feeling in the exact shape in which it exists in the poet's mind." Here he implies the importance of the symbol in artistic representation. But he prefers, I think unwisely, to treat the symbol as a minor aspect of his theory, and to place major emphasis upon shadowy and unverifiable assumptions about the presence of uncommunicative characteristics in poetical utterances and the absence of communicative impulses in the poet's mind.

For actual proof that poetry conveys something to its readers, we must turn from the examination of the weakness of such a theory as Mill proposes and consider our own experiences with poetic utterances. We would acknowledge that the plays of Shakespeare and Ibsen and Shaw really said something to us when we witnessed their production in the theatre. We might disagree with each other in our attempts to state what a given one of these plays had to say; we might even dislike what we thought any one of them said; but our disagreements and our dislikes would indicate that something had been transferred to our minds as a result of our contact with its author's words. We would also acknowledge that great epic poems—*The Divine Comedy* and *Paradise Lost* are excellent examples—communicated something to us when we read them. Prose fiction from the pen of Dickens, Thackeray, Hardy, Conrad, Hawthorne, Melville, Tolstoy, Manzoni, Flaubert has excited so much interest and such lively controversy that it could hardly be called uncommunicative or incapable of saying anything. Even lyric poetry, although it does not have as many willing readers as do the forms just mentioned, produces vivid and lasting effects upon those who submit themselves to its exacting disciplines. Mr. I. A. Richards observes: "But poetry itself is a mode of communication. What it communicates and how it does so and the worth of what is communicated form the subject-matter of criticism."[4] Indeed, anyone who wishes an empirical demonstration of the communicativeness of lyric poetry has only to turn to the book just cited. It describes Mr. Richards's procedure in assigning thirteen lyrics to students in his classes at Cambridge University and elsewhere, and in requiring those students to write a critique of each poem. By printing the poems and the comments elicited by each, Mr. Richards shows not only that poems transfer something to readers, but that the responses to a given poem display wide variety, and that the systematic study of these responses is a useful means of charting the course to be followed by teachers in giving students a more perfect control over poetry as one of the great modes of communication.

III

Although the poetical utterance shares with the rhetorical utterance a communicative function, the two differ from each other in an important way. The simplest way to describe this difference, as I have already indicated, is to say that the words which make up the rhetorical utterance lead the reader to states of reality, whereas the words

[4] *Practical Criticism: A Study of Literary Judgment* (London, 1929), p. 11. By permission of the publishers.

making up the poetical utterance lead the reader to things which stand by deputy for states of reality. These things which stand by deputy for states of reality are, as I earlier said, the poet's symbols. Thus lyric poetry, drama, and fiction may collectively be called the literature of symbol; expository prose, journalistic writing, oratory, and all the verbal utterances designed to deal directly with factual states and conditions in human experience, may collectively be called the literature of statement.[5]

In thus making symbolism the key term in the differentiation of poetry from rhetoric, I should like to guard myself against the inference that I am asserting the symbolist school of art to be superior to the rival schools of realism and naturalism. The symbolist school of art has claimed symbolism as its own peculiar property, and has made it appear that this term is out of place unless it is used to designate an artistic procedure that this school believes in and that the naturalists and realists do not believe in. Since the closing years of the nineteenth century, the symbolists have taken the position that realistic fiction or drama or poetry conveys what it has to say by literal means, by direct statements, for example, whereas the proper method is to use suggestion and indirection. It is true, of course, that there are differences between the detailed and the abstract methods of presentation, as can be seen if we compare a realistic play like Elmer Rice's *Street Scene* with Maeterlinck's symbolical *Blue Bird*. But as I use the term, symbolism would designate a common characteristic of these two plays, not a characteristic which the latter has and the former does not have. Thus realism and naturalism, on the one hand, and romance and allegory, on the other, would designate alternative ways or methods of presenting the things chosen by the author to stand by deputy for other things. The realist would treat a situation in such minuteness of detail that it would seem as if his purpose were that of a scientist describing a phenomenon; the allegorist would treat a situation in terms of a few of its salient characteristics. But the realist would be an artist, not a scientist, because his fully drawn situation would stand as the deputy of broadly analogous situations in a reader's experience; and the allegorist would be an artist, not a dreamer or schizophrenic, because his abstract situation would likewise stand as the delegate of parallel happenings in human life. Thus, it is of the symbol as a characteristic of artistic representation of any sort that I propose to speak; and this use of the term is amply justified by its accepted primary meaning.

We can see the difference between statement and symbolism if we regard readers as travelers going from one country to another far away, and utterances as the signposts along the road. The rhetorical signpost, we may say, contains the name of the country to which the traveler is going, and a number to indicate the number of miles to be covered before he reaches his destination. Names of real countries, and numbers to represent real distances, are characteristic of rhetorical signposts. The poetical signpost, we may say, contains the name of the winter season of the year, and a number to indicate the stages in the span of human life. It seems uncommunicative in any practical way; its words appear strange and obscure. Such strangeness and obscurity, such an ap-

[5] For a discussion of these terms in relation to De Quincey's distinction between the literature of knowledge and the literature of power, see Howell, W. S., "De Quincey on Science, Rhetoric, and Poetry," *Speech Monographs*, XIII (1946), 1-13.

parent lack of practical application, are traits of a poetical signpost. But suppose our traveler had the good sense to reflect that its words might have a bearing upon his journey. Suppose he understood the words to mean that when he arrived at his distant destination, the season of his life would be winter, and the total number of stages in that life would thus have been mainly devoted to the conquest of the space that stretched out beyond the signpost. Here would be information about his journey; and it might be as accurate as that on the other signpost. It might be more useful, too. For it would tend to place upon the journey a greater value, a greater significance in human terms, than the rhetorical signpost does. It would, for example, make the journey mean that the traveler would have no time for other things when it was over—that he would be old, then, and spent. Thus the accuracy and the utility of the one signpost in relation to the other are not grounds for determining the difference between them. The difference between them is that the poetical signpost gives directions about places and relations in space, not in words that refer to exact spatial relations and real places, as does the rhetorical signpost, but in words that (so far as my illustration is concerned) refer to temporal relations that stand by deputy or symbol for spatial relations. How it is that the words of a poem can concretely designate one thing, and can make a reader see that thing as the delegate of a constituency of other things, is to be explained by the fact that words carry literal and associative meanings, and that the poet can by his allusive yet concrete manner of presentation make us see in one conscious instant the thing directly named by his words, and related things suggested by that thing.

My illustration is of course subject itself to the hazards of metaphor. A metaphor says something about a given thing by asserting its significant likeness to something else, as when, in saying that a ship plows the sea, we lend meaning to a naval implement by giving it a characteristic of an agricultural implement. My metaphor tries to say something about poetry by likening it to a signpost, and there is danger that my comparison will say too little or too much or something untrue or partial. Hence, I should like, by attempting a more objective description of the relation between rhetoric and poetry, to guard against being misunderstood.

As I said before, the rhetorical utterance and the poetical utterance are both made up of words. Everyone will agree that words are arbitrary signs affixed by common consent to things, to activities of things, to characteristics of things, in our complex environment. Everyone knows that, by manipulating these arbitrary signs, he can show to himself and to others what relations and differences, what consequences to himself, he perceives among those things. If we think, then, of words as the signs of things, and of things as the "referents" of words, we can accept the notion that the meanings we assign to words are a reflection of the meanings we assign to their referents.

The problem of assigning a meaning to a rhetorical utterance would therefore appear to be the problem of determining what referents that utterance has—what things it designates, and what those things actually mean in our experience. The words, as we read them, call up in our mind the things to which they refer. Our experience has already to a degree made us familiar with those things, and has given us conceptions and ideas about them. As we read on, we

find ourselves moving among our experiences with things because the words before us stand for those things. Our transaction with the rhetorical utterance is complete when we have fully connected its words to their referents in our experience, and have, by this traffic with signs, extended our experience with things, or modified it, or rejected parts of it, or fully verified it, or perhaps not altered it at all.

The problem of assigning a meaning to a poetical utterance is also that of finding the referents for the words used in it. But the things to which a poetical utterance refers may be, for example, the events set forth in Shakespeare's *Hamlet,* and thus Shakespeare's words have these events as primary referents. We may read of these events, and then say that we are not princes, that our mother did not marry our paternal uncle just after our father died, and that our uncle did not then conspire to kill us. In other words, we may find no secondary referents in our own experience for the words in Shakespeare's play. We may even like *Hamlet,* nevertheless, for its exciting action and its memorable language. But as our own experience with life and with people deepens and grows, we may come to see that *Hamlet,* even without literal analogies in our own life, is in a sense our story, the story of everyman. The problem of Hamlet's delay, of his tormented unwillingness to take sides until it was too late, is not unlike that presented to all sensitive men in the eternal struggle against the evil of this world. At any rate, our problem in reading *Hamlet,* or any work of fiction or of poetry, becomes that of finding the second set of referents for its words.

The difference between this problem and that presented by the rhetorical utterance can be shown diagrammatically by letting *W* stand for the words we read, *E* stand for our experience with the things of our world, and *S* stand either for the experience that people like ourselves have with the things of their world, or for the things that are linked by convention, by association, by accidental or pertinent resemblance, to other things. In reading the rhetorical utterance, we go from *W* to that part of *E* which *W* is dealing with; in reading the poetical utterance, we go from *W* to *S* and thence onward by complex processes of association to that part of *E* which is relevant to *S*.

I do not mean to imply that the reader of either kind of utterance solves the whole problem of interpretation only by studying an author's words. The reader must of course seek assistance from other sources: from the study of the author's life and of his times; from the study of historical changes in the uses of words; from the study of the contemporary audience that the author addressed; from the study of the whole climate of opinion in which the author dwelt. Thus biography, history, linguistics, philosophy, must be brought to bear upon the problem of understanding what a given text, rhetorical or poetical, means. But the major clues to an author's meaning are his own words, and it is in studying them that we must proceed with an eye to the difference between statements and symbols.

IV

If it is right to say that the words which make up rhetorical and poetical utterances lead us to things in our own experience, and induce us either to consider those things directly or to consider them through intermediaries, then it is difficult to believe that the poetical utterance has none of the persuasive force universally admitted to be characteristic

of the rhetorical utterance. Either of these two forms of language has the power to make us see the things around us in a new way—to make us formulate new evaluations of our own experience, or to confirm us in our own previously formulated evaluations. Once we have changed or modified or verified or not changed the ideas which we inevitably and necessarily bring with us into our transactions with any author's words, we are in possession of a mental outlook that tends to have its own inexorable consequences in our future action. It is what we conceive things to be that determines how we act towards them, or how we fail to act. Our beliefs, our prejudices, our inhibitions, our complex orientations, towards the bewildering variety of things that make up our environment, force us to project them outward into our behavior and conduct. Thus, action is a consequence of something that happens within our consciousness or our subconsciousness as a result of our construct of interpretations, evaluations, insights, revelations, fears, hopes, about the things of our world. To deny to poetry its consequences in action would be to assert that poetry makes nothing happen within us when we read it or that the happening has nothing to do with the processes by which we reduce the things in the world to coherence and meaning. Neither of these assertions, as I have already shown, could be verified by the experience of the thoughtful reader of poetry. Some readers may say that poetry makes nothing happen to them, and in this case, at any rate, we can be sure that their subsequent action would not be appreciably influenced. But other readers have spent much time and ingenuity in describing what happenings are induced in them by poetry. We may accept their testimony as evidence of the reality of the happenings, and we may verify this evidence against the testimony of our own experience. Having done so, we would not be inclined to doubt that poetry brings to us a sense of the order and significance of things around us, and thus induces the outlook that, once it is accepted by us as true, determines our action.

The aesthetic factors in a poem and the rhetorical factors in a speech or piece of exposition are not to be interpreted to imply a difference between our sense of delight in the harmony of a work of art and our sense of conviction of the truth of a more practical communication. We ordinarily associate delight with a sense of harmony, and conviction with a sense of truth; but our delight is an aspect of conviction, as conviction is an aspect of delight. What I mean is that the sense of harmony which produces our delight in a poem is a correlative of the sense of truth which leads us to be convinced by an oration. Harmony may be said to be a correspondence between the realities of human life and the equivalent symbol, projected into language. The poet works to achieve this correspondence, the reader to perceive it. Truth may be said to be a correspondence between the realities of the objective world and the equivalent verbal statement. The scientist and orator work to achieve this correspondence, their audience to accept or perchance to reject it. Considerations like these, placed in a somewhat different context, led Walter Pater, in his celebrated essay, "Style," to affirm the resemblance between truth in science and beauty in literature. Said he:

> In the highest as in the lowliest literature, then, the one indispensable beauty is, after all, truth:—truth to bare fact in the latter, as to some personal sense of fact, diverted somewhat from men's ordinary sense of it, in the former; truth there as accuracy, truth

here as expression, that finest and most intimate form of truth, the *vraie vérité*.[6]

Pater conceived of the scientific utterance as one in which truth was achieved when the author's words accurately fitted the facts under his observation, without any intrusion of his own personality; the poetical utterance, in his view, achieved its truth or harmony when the author's words accurately accorded with his own peculiar imaginative sense of the facts under his observation. The difference between facts as transcribed with rigorous objectivity and facts as transcribed with a high degree of subjectivity led Pater to classify all verbal utterances into one or the other of two groups, which he respectively named the literature of fact and the literature of the imaginative sense of fact. His theory deserves careful study. It seems questionable in its assumption that complete objectivity is possible of attainment in scientific writing.[7] It seems questionable, too, in its assumption that oratory and poetry as subjective modes of discourse are to be considered essentially identical. But in its insistence upon the similarity of the concept of truth and that of literary beauty or harmony, it invites us to see the alliances and affiliations between the rhetorical and the poetical utterance, and to re-examine suspiciously the conventional dichotomies that would deny beauty to the one and persuasiveness to the other.

V

It would therefore appear that rhetoric and poetry, as the two chief modes of communication and persuasion, diverge from each other because the one uses words to illuminate factual matters, and the other uses words to illuminate things that in turn illuminate factual matters. This major difference explains others. It explains why it is that narration is the dominant pattern of the poetical utterance. Narration, with its elements of plot, setting, and characterization, enables the poet to represent human beings in action, and to draw together in the representation those diverse factors of environmental influence and individual predisposition that give meaning to conduct. Narration permits the reader to understand the particulars of his own situation by seeing them objectified as a meaningful fusion of analogous particulars. Narration uses analysis for the sake of synthesis. On the other hand, the dominant patterns of the rhetorical utterance are argument and exposition. These patterns proceed by generalization and division; these patterns permit the reader to understand a situation by seeing it as a complex fusion of its own particulars, temporarily isolated from analogous things; these patterns use synthesis for the sake of analysis. Without the poetical and the rhetorical modes of communication, or more broadly, without these two modes of understanding, human society would not exist. Rhetoric and poetry are as it were two equal ministers in the communicative structure of human affairs. Each has its own method of operation. Each has its own subjects of major interest. Society does not have to choose between them. Society needs only to use both, and to come to understand how both are most effectively to be used.

[6] *Appreciations with an Essay on Style* (London, 1927), p. 34.

[7] For a good examination of this assumption from the point of view of the historian, see Becker, C. L., *Everyman his own Historian* (1935), pp. 233-255.

THE SPEECH STYLE OF BENJAMIN DISRAELI

CARROLL C. ARNOLD*

JUDGMENTS of Benjamin Disraeli's speech style often reflect the political, ethnological, and artistic predispositions of their authors. One finds scattered through the score of biographical studies of this statesman frequent references to his "Oriental rhetoric," his union of "special genius with the spirit of the Orient," or his "alien penetration." The best of Disraeli's biographers and critics have dealt but generally with the elements that made the Tory spokesman famed as a Parliamentary stylist. "Courage and originality, unbounded cleverness, and that most effective weapon, . . . the power of sarcasm," are the qualities to which Monypenny and Buckle call attention in summarizing Disraeli's best oratorical achievements.[1] A. W. Ward describes Disraeli's style of oratory as one which derives its significance from its invective and "the imaginative faculty with which he was sumptuously endowed and which . . . he constantly turned to the fullest account . . . often as it was said, 'behind a mask.' "[2] Surely with the definitive biographical researches now at our disposal and the tolerably accurate speech texts available, we can draw more specific and therefore more profitable conclusions than these concerning the characteristics of Disraeli's language usage. It is to that problem that this paper is addressed.

I have been primarily interested in determining factors which raised Disraeli from obscurity to the front ranks of nineteenth century British politics. For this reason the Parliamentary session of 1851, the year in which Disraeli was for the first time assured of a Cabinet position, has been taken as the terminal period for this study.

The texts used in the preparation of this paper are the collations of newspaper reports published in *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*.[3] There are doubtless many inaccuracies in these texts; however, there seems no sufficient reason to believe that evaluation of the broader, recurring aspects of Disraeli's style is invalidated by these reportorial limitations.

The Experimental Period

Of Disraeli's first schoolmaster, the Reverend John Potticany, virtually nothing is known; however, at age thirteen Benjamin was transferred to the school of the Reverend Eliezer Cogan, a Unitarian minister and self-taught classical scholar of some note. "In Latin he bathed us in Cicero, and always impressed on us that, so far as style was concerned, in lucid arrangement of subject, and power of expression the *Pro Milone* was an education in itself," Benjamin later recalled.[4] Monypenny conjectures that the boy left Cogan's school at "about the end of his fifteenth year, and during the couple of years that followed continued his education at home. . . ."[5]

There seems every reason to conjecture further that these years of study at

*Assistant Professor of Speech, Cornell University.

[1] Monypenny, W. F. and G. E. Buckle, *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli* (1911-1920), II, 228.

[2] *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (1917), XIV, 143.

[3] London, 1837-1852. Hereafter referred to as *Debates*.

[4] Monypenny and Buckle, *op. cit.*, I, 25. Biographical information used in this paper is based upon this definitive work unless otherwise indicated.

[5] *Ibid.*, I, 25-26.

home must have been such as to encourage the youth's early interest in literary affairs. Into the society of Isaac D'Israeli, Benjamin's quiet, scholarly father, came such figures as Byron, Dr. Parr, Samuel Rogers and many lesser lights of literature and scholarship. It is not, therefore, surprising that the elements of style were the constant and particular interest of the student. One reads, for example:

> Virgil—2nd book of the Georgics, which begins with a splendid invocation to Bacchus; it, however, all vanishes in a sleepy lecture on grafting boughs and lopping trees.[6]

Cicero's *Pro Milone* remained the boy's favorite speech until he discovered Demosthenes' first Philippic. A note in the diaries reads:

> At length I must own that Cicero is his inferior. . . . We admire in Cicero the well-turned sentence and cadenced period, the subtile argument and the acute remark. But in reading Demosthenes we think not of these, our imagination is fired. . . .

One can surely say of these two years that study of the classics and the literary atmosphere in which he lived contributed toward drawing his creative interest to problems of style. Of *disciplined* and *systematic* study, however, the diaries show there was only a modicum.

Benjamin Austen, in whose office Disraeli had for a short time been a less than diligent law student,[7] had not deeply influenced the young man, but soon the minor literary circle surrounding Mrs. Austen became his common resort. Here Robert Plumer Ward, Theodore Hook, Henry Crabb Robinson, other writers, and a number of young artists gathered,[8] and under these influences Disraeli began his career as a novelist.

By February, 1826, the twenty-two year old author had progressed sufficiently with his *Vivian Grey* to solicit the aid of Mrs. Austen in its final drafting and anonymous publication.[9] The novel succeeded in sales but was roughly handled by critics; nevertheless, a sequel followed and Mrs. Austen again advised the author.

In 1830, Disraeli published his "pot boiler," *The Young Duke*. For the rhetorical critic, interest in *The Young Duke* arises from the fact that Disraeli received the advice of a new friend while the work was in progress. To Edward Bulwer, Benjamin sent his new novel and in return he received some valuable suggestions for the improvement of his literary style. Wrote Bulwer in April, 1830:

> I do think you should look with a harsh, and even hypercritical, eye upon all those antithetical neatnesses of style which make the great feature of your composition.
>
> Whenever they attain a witticism or a new truth . . . don't alter a syllable. But whenever you see that form of words which aims at a point and does not acquire it, be remorseless. . . . should you suspect I am in the least right . . . put yourself, some morning in a bad humor with Antithesis and Voltaire, and go carefully, pen in hand, over the manuscript.[10]

Bulwer was not a great stylist, but he touched upon the literary device that was to become a Disraelian trademark in debate. He directly advised against stylistic excesses which probably stemmed from Disraeli's undisciplined and unguided earlier study of literary technique. The modern reader of *The Young Duke* is only too aware of the soundness of Bulwer's advice, and,

[6] *Ibid.*, I, 27ff. Excerpts from Disraeli's early diary cited below are drawn from this source.

[7] Layard, Sir Henry A., *Autobiography and Letters* (1903), I, 47-48. Layard was the nephew of Benjamin Austen.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Monypenny and Buckle, *op. cit.*, I, 80-81.

[10] Bulwer-Lytton, Edward George, *Life, Letters and Literary Remains of Edward Bulwer, Lord Lytton* (1884), I, 607-608.

should he compare Disraeli's stylistic extravagances of 1830 with the incisive mastery of the spoken word displayed in the mid-forties, he might well believe that Bulwer's suggestions were eventually taken more seriously than the hastily published *Young Duke* seems to indicate.

A Mediterranean tour, financed from the sales of *The Young Duke*, prompted further literary experimentation, the production of *Contarini Fleming* and *Alroy* in 1832 and 1833 respectively. Both were experiments not altogether happy. In *Contarini Fleming* the author sought with fair success to portray the psychological development of a mystic. In *Alroy* he achieved a rhymed prose which brought him no credit from his reviewers. Even less fortunate was Disraeli's fragmentary effort in epic poetry, *The Revolutionary Epic*.

Despite the moderate success of these literary experiments, Disraeli now began to bend his efforts toward achieving a political career, and public address quite naturally interested him increasingly. On June 9, 1832, he appeared at High Wycombe as a candidate for Parliament. A flamboyant speech delivered in a flamboyant manner won him but twelve votes and showed that he had much to learn about effective speaking.[11] In November of the same year he delivered a somewhat more restrained speech in a second contest at High Wycombe, but was again defeated.[12] In spite of these rebuffs and mediocre speaking performances, the future Minister was nonetheless quite satisfied with his own effectiveness as an orator. After hearing Bulwer, Charles Grant, and the outstanding orators, Sheil and Macaulay, speak in the House of Commons, he confidently wrote to his sister, "Between ourselves, I could floor them all. . . . The time will come."[13] The time was not yet, however.

By the time of Benjamin's next political trial, a political adviser and patron had been found in the person of Lord Lyndhurst. Lyndhurst assisted him in preparations for a third and last campaign at High Wycombe and the resulting speech shows that Disraeli had learned a good deal, either from Lyndhurst, or from experience, or from both. His address to the electors was delivered on December 16, 1834, and was immediately published as "The Crisis Examined."[14] Here it can be said that Disraeli first succeeded in effective oral communication. For the first time he gave clear promise of his brilliant future.

That the young orator was still too fond of alliteration and unrelieved parallelism "The Crisis Examined" clearly shows, but the speech revealed powers of wit, satire, and cogent reasoning. The speaker concluded with one of his most famous satirical descriptions. The Reform Ministry he likened to the equestrian exhibition wherein the acrobat, Ducrow, nightly rode his six spirited horses about the show ring. So, the Prime Minister nightly advertised his celebrated Reform Cabinet, cried Disraeli, but as successive steeds were "seized with the staggers" they were successively replaced by jackasses until "puffing, panting, and perspiring, he pokes one sullen brute, thwacks another, cuffs a third and curses a fourth, while one brays to the audience and another rolls

[11] For reprint of contemporary newspaper accounts of the speech, see Kebbel, T. E., *Selected Speeches of the Earl of Beaconsfield* (London, 1882), I, 4.

[12] *Ibid.*, I, 5-9.

[13] *Letters of Benjamin Disraeli to His Sister*, ed., Ralph Disraeli (New York and London, 1904); Vol. XVIII of *Works*, 13. Letter dated February 7, 1883.

[14] For text, see Kebbel, *op. cit.*, I, 10-24.

in the sawdust." The audience was impressed by the speaker's improvement, but Disraeli was again defeated.[15]

Disraeli returned to London following this third defeat and engaged in writing political letters for publication in *The London Times*. Through Lyndhurst he became acquainted with Thomas Barnes, editor of *The Times*, and early in 1836 Disraeli began a series of public letters known as the "Letters of Runnymede." As a regular correspondent, he had the great benefit of some of Barnes' blunt criticisms:

> It is quite impossible to insert your letter to Sir John Hobhouse. It is so fiercely personal that he will have a right to demand the name of the writer. . . . [H]is political conduct you may do what you please with.
>
> Whatever faults Hobhouse labours under, he is not mean nor cowardly; but his understanding is weak & uncertain.[16]

Disraeli revised his letter but still evinced no clear understanding of the limits or proper objects of sarcasm. The revised letter was again returned with more criticism:

> . . . you put yourself in personal contrast with a man who has no means of retaliating by any *tu quoque*, as you & your actions must be totally unknown to him. This is unfair . . . & there is nothing for which the public has so quick an eye as unfairness in fight—whether physical or intellectual. . . . You can assume the allegations agt Hobhouse to be true & then without reference to yourself ask if such a man has a right to complain of rough treatment.[17]

As had Bulwer, Barnes dealt severely with the undisciplined aspects of Disraeli's style. Surely the polished Parliamentarian of the 1840's owed much to this sort of assistance. But though Disraeli's literary and oral style was being thus polished, the political aspirant had other very practical lessons to learn before he was ready to begin the steady climb to leadership.

Standing at Taunton in 1835, he had received his fourth defeat at the polls, but subsequently he gained an opportunity to enter a more promising contest. The district of Maidstone finally returned him to Parliament in 1837. But in his maiden speech, of which he had no doubt been dreaming for the past five years, he erred again. He attempted to take his audience by storm. He failed to judge the temper of the House toward clever young men who wrote novels and satirical newspaper articles. For his painstaking effort to shine too soon and his effrontery in attacking so established a member as Daniel O'Connell, Disraeli was hooted from the floor.[18]

After this initial failure as a Parliamentary speaker, Disraeli had at once to take stock of matters which his varied experience should already have taught him. He had to learn of audience adaptation, else the great career he envisioned would end in its beginning. Once again the faltering politician found excellent advice, this time from a political opponent, Richard Sheil. In Disraeli's words, Sheil made the following suggestions:

> As it is, you have shown to the House that you have a fine organ, that you have unlimited command of language, that you have courage, temper and readiness. Now get rid of your genius for a session. Speak often . . . but speak shortly. Be very quiet, try to be dull, only argue and reason imperfectly. . . . And in a short time the House will sigh for the wit and eloquence, which they all know are in you; . . . and then you will have the ear of the House and be a favourite.[19]

[15] Monypenny and Buckle quote the *Bucks Gazette* for January 16, 1835: "There was a total absence of those personalities which disgraced the last election." *Op. cit.*, I, 274.

[16] *The History of The Times, 1785-1841* (1935). I, 439-40.

[17] *Ibid.*, I, 440.

[18] The history of this speech is discussed in all biographical studies of Disraeli. The conclusions above are based upon the letters reprinted in Monypenny and Buckle, *op. cit.*, and upon the printed reports of the speech.

[19] *Ibid.*, II, 14. Letter from Disraeli to his sister, Sarah, December 11, 1837.

A week later Disraeli was again on his feet in the House. He spoke very briefly, modestly, and was heard.[20]

From 1837 until the end of the session of 1842 Disraeli spoke regularly and with increasing confidence and success. He reported to his wife the success of his 1842 speech on the consular services, defining the speech qualities he was seeking:

> [Smythe] particularly mentioned my manner, perfectly changed and different to what it used to be—'Exactly as you talk at the Carlton or at your own table,' he said, . . . 'the manner easy, a little nonchalant, and always tinged with sarcasm.'[21]

The speeches of Disraeli's first five years in Parliament furnish evidence that the orator was becoming more and more successful in adapting himself to the temper of the House. Never again did he seek to take the audience by storm; little by little he accustomed the House to his polished epigrams, subtle nuances, and oblique attacks upon arguments and persons. Thus was completed a major stage in the speech education of the Parliamentary debater and stylist.

As political differences between Sir Robert Peel and Disraeli grew more pronounced after 1842, the issues on which Disraeli spoke became such that the style in which he had been training himself was more in demand than any other. For the argumentative battles ahead, Disraeli's advisers and his own erratic, often unfortunate experiments had admirably prepared him.

The Language of Intellection

Among nineteenth century literary and political magazines, *Fraser's Magazine* was one of the more independent. Conservative in bias, its comments upon public personalities probably reflected the opinions of a large part of the educationally and politically literate body of English Conservatism. For these reasons it is indeed interesting to observe *Fraser's* changing evaluations of Benjamin Disraeli, novelist and Parliamentary speaker. Said *Fraser's* in 1845:

> But it is the misfortune of the man, that into whatever situation he may be thrown, he manages not only not to win, but to repel, the sympathies of his fellow-creatures. Look at him in the streets. Was there ever such an appearance of a man,—such an air of all that is most extraordinary in the human animal? . . . He has now become . . . a thorn, not a very sharp one, certainly, but still an annoyance as far as it goes, in the side of a minister, to whom he was ready to give his utmost support, provided he would have connected him with the government, even as vice-president of the Board of Trade. . . .
>
> [H]e may take our words for it, that, one and all, they [the House members] hold Mr. Disraeli himself in small esteem.[22]

But when Peel had been "annoyed" for a mere eighteen additional months by the Mephistophelean Mr. Disraeli, *Fraser's* was forced to say:

> . . . in watching the Protean efforts of Mr. Disraeli to slip in many false characters into the Temple of Fame, we shall strive not to lose sight of the remarkable fact, that at the very eleventh hour, when he was supposed to have burnt out all his natural fire, and to have 'gone out,' like many other eccentric human pyrotechnics, with a most unsavory odour, he should suddenly have shot up again with renewed life and brilliancy, which has had no parallel since the genius of Canning ceased to illumine the dull atmosphere of senatorial mediocrity with the fitful flashes of his incomparable wit.[23]

It is, therefore, our present duty to examine the language which wrung from the unwilling such praise for brilliance and wit.

As one reads the speeches of the nineteenth century Tory-Conservative, the intellectualism of his expression soon

[20] *Debates*, XXXIX, 1093.
[21] Monypenny and Buckle, *op. cit.*, II, 127-28.
[22] "Mr. Benjamin Disraeli, M. P.," (Review of Disraeli's novel, *Sybil*), XXXI (1845), 729 and 736.
[23] "Literary Legislators, No. 1, Mr. Disraeli," *ibid.*, XXXV (1847), 81.

bears in upon the mind. The stylistic devices which he characteristically used stimulated the "intellect and imagination, which are solitary things."[24] But they made the political and personal attributes, in which he dealt so constantly, gleam in memorable phrases. Outstanding among these devices was antithesis, the stylistic form first observed in his early diaries and predominant in his novels.[25]

In the preparation of this paper, a small experiment was performed in an effort to determine the actual prevalence of the antithetical pattern in Disraeli's speaking. Twenty passages, originally selected to illustrate aspects of style other than the antithetical, were re-examined to determine the frequency with which antitheses also appeared. The antithetical formula appeared in fourteen of the twenty passages.

To further illustrate this characteristic, the following nine excerpts from Disraeli's 1842 to 1852 speeches have been chosen as typical of the memorable passages most frequently singled out for quotation by biographers and critics. Only passage No. 3 fails to incorporate on or more antithetical constructions:

(1) On Peel's inability to settle upon the cause of troubles with Ireland: "It was the Pope one day; potatoes the next."

(2) Of Peel's drift away from protectionism: "You must not contrast too strongly the hours of courtship with the years of possession."

(3) On the same subject: "[Peel] has tamed the shrew of Liberalism by her own tactics. He is the political Petruchio who has outbid you all."

(4) Of Peel: "The right honourable Gentleman caught the Whigs bathing, and walked away with their clothes. He has left them in full enjoyment of their Liberal position and he is himself a strict Conservative of their garments."

(5) Of Peel's strict control of the members who followed him: "[His] horror of slavery extends to every place except the benches behind him. There the gang is still assembled, and there the thong of the whip still sounds."

(6) On Peel's Conservative free trade Government: "For me there remains this at least—the opportunity of expressing thus publicly my belief that a Conservative Government is an organised hypocrisy."

(7) "Ireland three years ago was like a poor man struggling against entering the workhouse; Ireland is now a contented pauper."

(8) "The Chancellor of the Exchequer, during the whole Session, has been bringing home barbers' basins instead of knightly helms; and at the last moment, . . . he finds instead of a surplus a deficiency, and instead of reducing taxation, he commemorates his second year of finance by a second loan."

(9) Disraeli alludes to Peel's involvement in the overthrow of Canning, from whom Peel had just quoted lines ending "Save, O save me from a candid friend!": "The theme, the poet, the speaker—what a felicitous combination! Its effect in debate must be overwhelming; and were it addressed to me, all that would remain for me would be thus publicly to congratulate the right honourable Gentleman, not only on his ready memory, but on his courageous conscience."

The frequent appearance of the antithetical formula in these often quoted passages and in passages which, though chosen for other purposes, show the predominance of antithesis, must be taken as evidence that Disraeli used the device with considerable deliberateness. The same illustrations also reflect other typically Disraelian qualities. Anti-climax, humor, sarcasm, or satire appear repeatedly. Contrasts between an opponent's grandest presumptions and his worst practice or lowest motive were the dramatic elements in his hits. It was for such skillful contrasts that the House waited when Disraeli rose to speak, but the debater rarely aimed beyond intel-

[24] Bailey, John, *Some Political Ideas and Persons* (1922), 117.

[25] See *supra* for examples of passages from the diaries and for Bulwer's comment on *The Young Duke*.

lectual reactions. He seldom sought to touch the elemental wants and desires of his listeners.

Whether from a conscious desire to speak in language which introduced the "new and important distinctions" with which Ralph Waldo Emerson credited him,[26] from a conservative distaste for jargon and loose phraseology, or from the requirements of sarcasm and effective ridicule, Disraeli assuredly chose his words with more than ordinary care. The listener was characteristically left to complete for himself the inferences woven into language which, in its primary meanings, was innocuous and almost ordinary. Carefully aiming his remarks at Sir Robert Peel's pride in the largeness of his own views, Disraeli concluded his speech on the Irish Arms Bill with the hope that

> . . . the time would come when a party framed on true principles would do justice to Ireland, not by satisfying agitators—not by adopting in despair, the first quack remedy . . . , but by really penetrating the mystery of this great misgovernment . . . and . . . put an end to a state of things which was the bane of England and opprobrium of Europe.[27]

Even through a third person report, the reader is still able to understand Disraeli's subtle strike at Peel's so-called "great remedial measure" for Ireland. Hansard's report of Peel's reply includes nearly two columns devoted to the Minister's self-defense against the charges of intellectual meanness so neatly planted in the jibes quoted above.[28]

Speaking on Lord Russell's budget, the Tory-Conservative denied the liberal doctrine that "Manchester principles" gave assurance of unbroken peace:

> Sir, this idea of perpetual peace is one that at various intervals has agitated the spirit of men—it has been one not confined to mere enthusiasts—to *preachers on their tubs*—to *lonely eremites* in their cells—or *dreaming monks* in solitary deserts. . . . I need not remind the House what has been the barren result of these beautiful aspirations.[29]

Those who heard Disraeli's speech in full had no difficulty in identifying the "preachers" with the Anti-Corn Law Leaguers of earlier years, the "eremite" with the Utilitarian prophet, Jeremy Bentham, and the "monk" with Abbé St. Pierre, to whom Disraeli had traced Cobden's peace premises. Such were the pleasures which Disraeli's precise subtleties in language afforded his listeners.

When the author-statesman made use of figurative language, the intellectualism of his speech style was not relieved. Said one of his biographers, "He had not enough of nature in him, he lived too perpetually in abstract plans and schemes, to be able to distil a beautiful or poetic side from sensuous life."[30]

Whatever may have been the psychological explanation, Disraeli's metaphors were weighed with subtle, intellectual connotations, skillfully planned and suggestively delivered. Manchester was "the fatal author of these pernicious principles," the support of whose doctrines was merely "mimetic" on the part of the Liberal Government.[31] Peel was the sort of Parliamentarian who "traces the steam-engine always back to the tea-kettle. His precedents are generally tea-kettle precedents." A few moments later, the detractor found the Minister "a great Parliamentary middleman . . . [who] bamboozles one party and plunders the other. . . ."[32]

[26] *Journals*, eds., Emerson, E. W. and Forbes, W. E. (Boston and New York, 1912), VII, 503. Entry for September 10, 1848.

[27] *Debates*, LXXI, 437, August 9, 1843.

[28] *Ibid.*, LXXI, 460-62 and 468.

[29] February 18, 1848, *Debates*, XCVI, 954. Italics mine.

[30] Brandes, Georg M. C., trans., Mrs. George Sturge, *Lord Beaconsfield* (London, 1880), 159.

[31] "On the Income Tax," March 10, 1848, *Debates*, XCVII, 422 and 416.

[32] "On the Maynooth College Grant," April 11, 1845, *Debates*, LXXIX, 558 and 565.

In an effort to determine to what extent sense perceptions and intellection were the bases of Disraeli's metaphorical comparisons I have carefully examined eighty-four extended, metaphorical passages from seventeen speeches delivered between 1843 and 1850. Of these examples, seventy are exclusively based upon abstract comparatives. In ten examples, the comparisons rest upon sense-perceived qualities, while in four instances the intellectual or abstract elements of comparison were found to be intermingled with sensuous elements. There seems, then, ample evidence to justify Brandes' generalization that Disraeli touched the abstract and intellectual much more frequently than the sensuous.

The same subtle penetration characterized Disraeli's use of quotation. In his hands the device was primarily a means of dramatizing ridicule and accusation. The speaker apparently found it easier to come to grips with both an argument and its propounder if the former were attributed to the latter by means of actual or pretended direct quotation.

Sometimes it was to make an opponent condemn himself that words were placed in his mouth. By assigning to Peel the statement, "I, a protectionist Minister, mean to govern England by the aid of the Anti-Corn-Law League . . . as for the country Gentlemen, why, I snap my fingers in their face,"[33] Disraeli was able to condemn the Minister's apostasy and ridicule his claims to party leadership in a single statement. Again, by placing a number of Cobden's more impassioned and extravagant utterances in juxtaposition, both argument and arguer were made to appear ludicrous, if not hysterical:

> The Protectionists' conduct is too transparent. . . . The Committee must be aware of what is going on. There is too much at stake! The income tax is at stake—that foundation of our prosperity—that only guarantee for the future comfort of this country.
>
> The course you have taken was, from the first, most injudicious. . . . Here are 150 Protectionists come down to take you at your word, and free trade trembles and totters to its base. . . .[34]

Peel, Graham, Wilson, Sir Charles Wood, and a host of others found themselves quoted to their discomfiture during the decade. In every quotation there was that remnant of the true utterance which gave validity to the supposed testimony, but there was also Disraeli's own touch which made the speaker testify against himself. Disraeli opened for all to see, not the feelings, but the intellectual shortcomings of those he quoted.

One cannot leave Disraeli's speech style without considering his perorations. Sometimes it was with real and sometimes with simulated indignation that the future Minister invoked the wrath of the House as of a jury. Among the thirty speeches analyzed for this investigation, exactly half conclude upon such notes of denunciation, while in several additional cases the speech is climaxed with a passage of invective although the actual conclusion summarizes constructive argument.

The language of Disraeli's invective had always the sharp edge of truth which cut disinterestedly into the political character and political career of whatever opponent might be associated with the proposition being opposed. Thus, in language somewhat less severe than usual, the Tory-Conservative concluded his final speech on the Corn Law

[33] "On the Corn Importation Bill," May 15, 1846, *Debates*, LXXXVI, 674.

[34] "On the Property Tax Bill," May 2, 1851, *Debates*, CXVI, 478-80.

question with such an assault upon his chief victim of the decade:

> I have that confidence in the common sense, I will say the common spirit of our countrymen, that I believe they will not long endure this huckstering tyranny of the Treasury Bench—these political pedlars that bought their party in the cheapest market, and sold us in the dearest. I know, Sir, that there are many who believe that the time is gone by when one can appeal to those high and honest impulses that were once the mainstay and the main element of the English character. I know, Sir, that we appeal to a people debauched by public gambling—stimulated and encouraged by an inefficient and short-sighted Minister. I know that the public mind is polluted with economic fancies; a depraved desire that the rich may become richer without the interference of industry and toil. I know, Sir, that all confidence in public men is lost. But, Sir, I have faith in the primitive and enduring elements of the English character. It may be vain now in the midnight of their intoxication, to tell them that there will be an awakening of bitterness; it may be idle now in the spring-tide of their economic frenzy to warn them that there may be an ebb of trouble. But the dark and inevitable hour will arrive. Then, when their spirit is softened by misfortune, they will recur to those principles that made England great, and which, in our belief, can alone keep England great. Then too, perchance they may remember, not with unkindness, those who, betrayed and deserted, were neither ashamed nor afraid to struggle for the 'good old cause'—the cause with which are associated principles the most popular, sentiments the most entirely national—the cause of labour—the cause of the people—the cause of England.[35]

It was this power, the ability to cut up political figures without recourse to supercilious moral judgments, which made Disraeli the most dangerous antagonist in the House. During the decade from 1842 to 1852 this speaker literally spent hours dissecting the political careers and intellectual capacities of opponents, yet almost never did he touch upon questions of personal honesty. He might allege colossal ineptitude or political cupidity, but his every opponent emerged from the scathing a reputable British gentleman, no matter how stupid or politically irresponsible.

Never before 1852 did the future Minister achieve sustained, impassioned utterance in a patriotic vein. He was the spokesman of opposition—organized and unorganized. He argued his cases with didactic impersonality and professional artistry, accusing more often than defending. Once his powers had developed to the full there was no member of the House who could meet the great debater's cold, unimpassioned assaults. Disraeli's was language which turned the spotlight on incongruities, turned distinctive phrases to the work of entire trains of argument, called forth judgments of deeds, policies, and men, but eschewed the idiom of the senses or the heart.

Conclusions

Since historians and critics admit without argument that Benjamin Disraeli was an extraordinary Parliamentary stylist, this paper examines some of the sources and qualities of that excellence.

That his limited formal education and unsystematic home reading could alone have produced Disraeli's oral incisiveness seems doubtful. The evidence reviewed here suggests that a considerable part of his success may be credited to his own experimentation and to the influence of such advisers as Mrs. Benjamin Austen, Edward Bulwer, Lord Lyndhurst, and above all Thomas Barnes and Richard Sheil.

Antithesis, anti-climax, humor, satire, and sarcasm were outstanding qualities of the Tory-Conservative's language. These elements, so often described by contemporaries as "cold," are discovered to have rested upon subjectively perceived qualities and abstractions rather

[35] "On the Corn Importation Bill," May 15 1846, *Debates*, LXXXVI, 677-78.

than upon sense-perceptions. Selecting his terms with great precision and formulating his metaphors and epigrams with utmost care, Disraeli nonetheless seldom sought to touch sentiments or emotions through resort to moralizing verbalisms or Victorian stereotypes. It was, in fact, in the role of the prosecutor or advocate that he could consistently excel; then the style and the man were one: clear, keen, often brilliant, but always aloof.

MAJOR FACTORS IN THE RHETORIC OF HISTORIANS

CARL B. CONE*

FOR three generations historians have paid homage to Leopold von Ranke as the founder of the "scientific study" of the materials out of which histories are written. Early in his career Ranke wrote that he did not seek to use history as a discipline for judging the past in order to instruct the present and benefit the future. His intention was less lofty and not at all didactic in the sense in which the eighteenth century had understood history. Yet Ranke was more ambitious. He wanted "to show what actually occurred." With all of their admiration for Ranke's work, which for sheer bulk alone would command respect, historians have not agreed about the meaning and importance of Ranke's credo.

Whatever its significance for the philosophy of history, Ranke's statement contains three implications that are relevant to a discussion of the rhetoric of historians. The first is the problem of purpose in writing history. The presence or absence of purpose will affect the selection of facts and the arrangement, ordering, and emphasis of facts. The second implication poses this problem: what shall be the content of history? With what in the life of the past must the historian concern himself? When Ranke said that he wanted "to show what actually occurred," he set for himself a goal that he did not achieve, that no historian ever has achieved, and that none ever will, or perhaps ever should. Without attempting, however, to assert that every minute incident in the "unrecoverable totality" of the past demands or deserves the attention of historians, it is still fair to say that Ranke himself neglected large and important segments of human experience. In his concern for the history of states he failed to treat adequately the social and economic development of the European peoples and the history of ideas. If historians can never attain completely the aim of Ranke, they can approach it more nearly than did Ranke and his contemporaries without developing a fetish for minutiae. Historians of the twentieth century are more concerned with social, economic and intellectual history than were their predecessors. The consequence of thus enlarging the content of history is directly to affect the rhetoric and rhetorical problems of historians. New materials and new points of view require alterations in presentation. That part of rhetoric embraced by disposition will be changed because as histories differ in content, they demand different treatments.

A third derivative from Ranke's credo, and one that is closely related to the content of a history, is the scope of a historian's work. Whether the historian sets out to write an article, a monograph, or a multi-volume history, has a strong influence upon his rhetoric. Time and space concepts go into the determination of the magnitude of the work. The historian may seek only to explain or relate an incident at a moment of time, or he may attempt to narrate the evolution of an institution or a people over a long period of years. He may likewise treat of an occurrence within a point of space, or he may deal with a country or a region. In any case he is seeking to tell some part of what actually occurred, and his work,

*Assistant Professor of British History, University of Kentucky.

depending upon the subject with which he is concerned, will have a certain magnitude both chronologically and spatially.

The following discussion of the rhetoric of historians, then, is based upon the three factors of purpose, content and scope as significantly influencing the rhetoric of historians.

I

The ancients thought of rhetoric frankly in terms of persuasion or winning an argument. The nature of one's audience, the circumstances under which the presentation was to be made, the purpose of the speech—whether it was a legal action before a jury or an attempt to influence the decision of a legislative body—all of these factors had to be considered in the selection and organization of the materials, the style and the delivery of the oration.

The ancients also emphasized rhetoric because success in political action was that most sought after by the citizens of Athens or Rome. Fame and fortune were attainable through politics. The education and the training of the youth in Greece and Rome were directed towards an active political life. Although Plato detested the Sophists, he may not have been entirely objective in his dislike of those very popular teachers who emphasized the studies, among them rhetoric, that would aid a young man to attain a high public office and make life in politics a success.

In this climate of opinion the ancients discussed the meaning of rhetoric and emphasized purpose as a factor in persuasion.

No historian, of course, has ever written without some purpose or intention in mind. A book written to explain or to narrate in order to show what actually occurred, however objective the author, has been written for the purpose of revealing what seems to the writer to be historical truth. Such a book may approach the ideal that historians try to achieve. Perhaps this is not the kind of purpose one thinks of as having a conscious influence upon rhetoric. Yet such regard for truth and fear of distortion or falsehood will produce a cautious style that eschews strong affirmations and contains many qualifying words and phrases, because the more the historian knows about his subject and the more impartial he tries to be, the more fully he will be aware of the danger of positive statements and generalizations.

It is the purpose in the sense of preconception that is more apposite to this discussion. The historian who has a thesis to prove, who has a preconceived notion as to how things were, and who attempts to prove his point by the marshalling of selected historical evidence, is the one whose rhetoric will be most directly influenced by purpose. If he is completely dishonest he will admit only the evidence that supports his thesis and omit all facts that bear against it. If he admits both favorable and unfavorable evidence he will emphasize the former kind and minimize the importance of the latter. In drawing his conclusions he will be guided by the evidence favorable to his case.

When historians object to this method of writing history, they are not denying anyone the right to form opinions or sum up evidence. The historian may very properly pass judgments if he has fairly included and weighed all the facts he has gathered, and then admits the conclusion which the evidence has inexorably forced upon him. Nor do historians any longer object to the formulation of hypotheses. The hypothesis, used properly, is an important part of scientific method, and the employment

of hypotheses by the historian need not imply preconception and falsification or refusal to follow where facts lead.

The represhensible practice of writing history out of preconceptions is uncommon among professional American historians. What there is of this kind of history today is inspired by political beliefs. The Marxist historian, for example, probably has certain predispositions that influence his selection of facts, his ordering of them and the emphases he puts upon them. And the Marxist might retort that his opponents are influenced (unconsciously, perhaps, if he is a charitable Marxist) by environmental factors in their writing of history.

There were certain nineteenth-century historians who clearly wrote to support anterior convictions and whose rhetoric was influenced because of preconceptions. Macaulay wrote history from the Whig point of view and used history to support his Whig convictions. While not as unfair to individual Tories as is popularly thought, Macaulay's tone and shading leave little doubt as to where his sympathies lay. There can be even less doubt about James Anthony Froude. He had a pronounced anti-Romish bias before he began his *History of England from 1529 to the death of Elizabeth*, and his studies on the Tudor period strengthened his convictions. His spectacular and absorbing work rings out his belief that the break from Rome was much the best thing that ever happened to England. This conviction in turn led not so much to the selection of only those facts that supported his belief as to an undue emphasis upon those that upheld his contentions. His interpretations of the events and personalities of the period, such as the execution of Thomas More, the character of Henry VIII, or the position of parliament in relation to the king, were determined by his hostility to Rome. Froude was sincere, and not dishonest, but his strong convictions led him into extreme judgments. His passion infused a life into his subject and gave a verve to his style, and as a result Froude, with Macaulay, is one of the historians of the century whose works are most readable.

This kind of nationalistic passion courses through the history of France written by Jules Michelet, the writer of the finest prose in French historiography. Although he follows the chronological pattern, as did Macaulay and Froude, his rhetoric is freer from the rigidities of the time sequence. Seeking to tell the life of the past as a whole, he is concerned not so much with dates and reigns as with people, ideas, and institutions. His history, therefore, is less a recording of facts than a painting of scenes, for his interests are life, color, movement and growth. Michelet often digresses from the sequential pattern to examine matters from other times and places as they are relevant to his immediate discussion, and he lingers lovingly over the great events in French history such as the career of Joan of Arc.

From Macaulay, Froude, and Michelet one comes away with the feeling that they appreciate the spirit of times past, that they have succeeded in conveying to the reader something of that spirit. Their rhetoric is in part the product of their convictions, especially the rhetoric of Froude and Michelet from whom one derives almost a mystical connotation.

There is something larger than the Whig party in Macaulay's history, for he views England in terms of the party. His purpose is to identify the rise of English prosperity with the Whig influence. In his preface he tells of his purpose and how he is to accomplish it. For

nearly two pages he lists the subjects he must treat in order to show how England has progressed, how her history "during the last hundred and sixty years is eminently the history of physical, of moral, and of intellectual improvement," Not that he intended to distort history by omitting disasters or reverses. In a way those served to emphasize the general trend of progress, for "unless I greatly deceive myself, the general effect of this chequered narrative will be to excite thankfulness in all religious minds, and hope in the breasts of patriots."

After two chapters to refresh his readers on the history of England before 1685, Macaulay is not yet ready to begin his narrative of the history of England from the accession of James II. He devotes Chapter III to a general discussion of the England of the time, telling of population, wealth, resources and some of the social and cultural aspects of the country. Any reader would compare and contrast the England of 1685 and the mid-nineteenth century, and improvement would be immediately recognized.

From this point onward the story is told chronologically, in great detail, with admirable character sketches of the leading persons. That of King William III is justly famous. Macaulay also moves backward and forward within the chronological framework of history, drawing analogies. Historical parallels are dangerous rhetorical devices and sometimes misleading ones, but they come naturally to one like Macaulay, whose prodigious memory had furnished his mind with a wealth of anecdotes and information drawn from his reading. In order to make clear how the Protestants wished the Pope well in his contest with Louis XIV, Macaulay recalls how "in the past century, many who regarded Pious the Seventh as Antichrist were well pleased to see Antichrist confront the gigantic power of Napoleon." This is a happy analogy and served Macaulay's purpose of clarification by referring to his readers' knowledge and experience. Thus also his description of London and its growth. In the time of James II, Southampton House, he says, stood on the edge of open fields. A century later that palace was removed "to make room for a new city, which now covers with its squares, streets, and churches, a vast area, renowned in the seventeenth century for peaches and snipes." So much for physical growth.

These methods of depiction are defensible if used properly, but the same warnings apply to them that Aristotle mentioned in discussing metaphors. Less defensible, perhaps, is another of Macaulay's favorite artifices: rationalization, as used to explain motives and causation. To rationalize may be to add life, color, and flavor to history, but the analysis may or may not be accurate and certainly can be questioned. At the beginning of his fifth chapter Macaulay describes the feelings of some of the Whig leaders who had taken refuge in the Low Countries at the end of the reign of Charles II. Where Macaulay received his impressions he does not say, and the reader wonders whether Macaulay is not passing off as the thoughts of these Whig leaders what his own would be under similar circumstances. The refugees were "under the influence of that peculiar illusion which belongs to their situation. A politician driven into banishment by a hostile faction generally sees the society which he has quitted through a false medium. Every object is distorted and discolored by his regrets, his longings, and his resentments. . . . The longer his expatriation, the greater does this hallucination

become. . . . Thus they become ripe for enterprises which would at once be pronounced hopeless by any man whose passions had not deprived him of the power of calculating chances." All this makes intriguing reading.

If purpose often determines the selection of facts and their arrangement, it is not so much the separate facts as the tendency and impact of the work as a whole that purpose most clearly determines. One must read Froude's entire history of England and not isolated bits of it to learn whether he is justified in saying in his next to concluding paragraph that "Princes, who are credited on the wrong side with the evils which happen in their reigns, have a right in equity to the honour of the good. The greatest achievement in English history, the 'breaking the bonds of Rome', and the establishment of spiritual independence, was completed without bloodshed under Elizabeth's auspices, and Elizabeth may have the glory of the work." Froude continued, "Many problems growing out of it were left unsettled," and then, in the voice of Victorian England, with its confidence in the inevitable moral and material progress of mankind, "But the worst legacy which princes or statesmen could bequeath to the country would be the resolution of all its perplexities, the establishment once and forever of a finished system, which would neither require nor tolerate improvement." It is not this or that fact or interpretation but the accumulation of facts, judgments, and innuendoes that give Froude's work its persuasive effect.

In his recent book, *Prophets and Peoples*, Hans Kohn discusses the leading exponent of nationalism in each great European country. For France he chooses Michelet. An ardent apostle of nationalism, Michelet felt that the French Revolution was the greatest glory in the history of his country. In it was epitomized the unified spirit of the French people. At the end of his second volume of the history of France, Michelet added a note in which he said "The France of the present day, in its oneness and identity, may very well forget that old, heterogeneous France which I have described. The Gascon may not choose to recognize Gascony, nor the Provençal, Provence; to which I answer, that there is no longer a Provence or a Gascony, but a France. This France I now present with all the differences of its ancient and original divarication into provinces. The latter volumes of my history will show her in her unity." And so the theme of Michelet's history is the progress of France toward unity; the hero is the French people as an organic and almost mystical entity. Michelet's use of the present tense heightens the emotion that pervades his history and intensifies the sense of becoming that Michelet sees as the destiny of France throughout her history. That concept of development from diversity to oneness influences Michelet's invention, disposition, and style.

II

The second aspect of Ranke's credo has to do with the content of history. If history is defined in its broadest sense it is the story of all the life and activities of mankind. This is what Charles Beard calls "history-as-actuality," and from which he distinguishes "history-as-written." The second kind can never be more than a part of the first. Political history, which is one type of "history-as-written" is only a narrow segment of human experience, and there have to be histories of other phases of man's activity if written history is to approach being coextensive with "history-as-actuality."

In writing these other histories, the

historian is bound to be affected by the climate of opinion of his age and his writings will reflect the beliefs and tendencies of his contemporaries. The "New History," as James Harvey Robinson called it, began to appear in the early years of the present century and showed the wider interests of historians as they departed from the traditional political, legal, constitutional, and institutional treatments of the nineteenth century historians, who, in their day, reflected the interests of their society. The emphasis upon economic history represents the clear admission of the influence of economic factors in moulding thought and institutions. Louis M. Hacker's *Triumph of American Capitalism* considers economic influences as determinative. Social history grows out of an interest in people—how they were born, grew up, what they ate and wore, how they worked and played and reared their families and finally died, and even how they were buried. Perhaps this interest in the lives of ordinary people is in part a result of the attainment of political power by the masses. As long as states were governed by the few, there was little interest in what the people did or thought. But when political authority is admitted, especially by modern dictators, to reside in the people, then the life of the people in times past becomes significant.

Intellectual and cultural histories are part of this enlarged concept, and perhaps for the same reason as social history. Sooner or later the thought of a few outstanding thinkers filters down among the masses. Jefferson and Turgot lived in a period when the philosophy of natural rights, a century old in the form they knew it, was part of the atmosphere. The physics and astronomy, now accepted without question or conscious exertion by most people, was developed over a century from Copernicus through Brahe, Kepler and Galileo to Newton, and not until almost our own day was it the possession of more than the educated minority.

With the expansion of the content of history according to the relativist theory that the study of history is governed by the climate of opinion and interests of the age in which the historian lives—Frederick Jackson Turner phrased it thus, "Each age writes the history of the past anew with reference to the conditions uppermost in its own time"—the rhetoric of the historian changes. When the English historian, Freeman, wrote history, he thought of his task as being the reconstruction of the political life of the past, for to him history was but "past politics." So he wrote a detailed and masterful (within its limits) history of the Norman Conquest, but his *Norman Conquest* is only past politics and battles.

Political history is perhaps the easiest to manage and arrange. Such history falls neatly within a chronological framework built of reigns and presidencies or dates of laws and battles, and events follow one another in an orderly time sequence. With slight concern for underlying factors, economic, social, psychological, the writer of political history has little difficulty with the problems of causation.

Of course, chronology cannot be eliminated from the rhetoric of the historian. It cannot be otherwise because human actions occur within the concept of time, and change is always a part of the pasage of time. The history of an idea, like *The Idea of Nationalism* by Hans Kohn or *The Great Chain of Being* by Arthur O. Lovejoy, must perforce be presented chronologically. But the writer of social, economic, or intellectual history is much less the slave of chronol-

ogy as he describes, analyzes, or measures. Yet this freedom to range carries with it certain rhetorical responsibilities. The social or economic historian draws his material from more widely scattered sources and from a greater variety of human activities, but his strictly rhetorical problems of selection of facts, arrangement, ordering and organization, shaping and toning, as well as styling are made more difficult. The development of thought or the way a people lived is not as easily described as the session of a legislature or the holding of an election. A parliamentary debate or a battle lends itself to more vivid styling than a set of statistics, let us say, about hogsheads of pork floated down the Mississippi in a given year.

The rhetorical difficulties of social, economic, or cultural history may, in part, account for some of the deficiencies of the histories in these fields. General textbooks of history, especially those called histories of civilization or of a people, often fail to present social or economic history as satisfactorily as political history. The ordinary textbook usually presents several chapters of political narrative. Then at the end of a period, most often blocked out in its political context, the writer feels it is time for him to insert a chapter on economic, social, and intellectual development. Thus his chronological framework is basically political, yet he attempts to compress these other materials into that outline, perhaps with the tacit admission that economic or social history has a vexing habit of not corresponding or conforming to the reigns of kings or passage of laws. The occasional chapter on social, economic, and intellectual development, begrudingly admitted to the text and tightly squeezed into a political narrative, is therefore poorly done, being often nothing but lists of names, books and inventions with a sentence or two about each.

With somewhat more hesitancy it may be said that social, economic, or intellectual history is rhetorically more difficult to write because it is inherently more difficult to assimilate and understand. One often feels in reading the chapters on these subjects in the usual textbook treatments that they are poorly done because the writer is on less familiar ground. A wider range of knowledge is required than for political history, and the historian still receives a basic political education in his training for his profession. Good writing of social or intellectual history comes only after much reading and serious reflection, and a longer period of time goes into the maturation of this kind of historian.

A historian who has written successfully upon social and economic history is George Macaulay Trevelyan. In his *England under the Stuarts* and his *England under Queen Anne* there are introductory chapters that are masterpieces of condensation and vividness for providing the setting for the political narrative. The reader of these chapters finishes them with an indelible impression, and as he reads the rest of the book, he interweaves these histories for he has a good understanding of the milieu in which political history operates. The reader proceeds through the book with political events always occurring before the back drop of economic and social developments. Trevelyan's gift of phrase-making and his ability to write provocative sentences that start a train of association in the reader's mind is one part of the explanation of his success. The organization of his material is another. But one is always aware that here is a writer whose knowl-

edge of his subject is vast. Allusions to literary characters or to incidental events come easily and aptly with Trevelyan. In his *English Social History,* for example, he drops a statement about the composition of a cricket team in Kent in the eighteenth century that points up the contrast he is drawing between English and French society, the former being more fluid than the latter. On this cricket team was a noble, but the captain was a member of the working class. This simple illustration contains a volume of explanation about some of the differences between English and French political history. Trevelyan's knowledge of the facts of English history and his ability to draw out of his factual armory the illustrations most appropriate for his purposes, along with his understanding of the interconnection of the various histories enable him to succeed where others fail.

The great *Histoire de France* by Ernest Lavisse and others, also contains well-written sections on economic and social history. The political narrative is separate from the other treatments, but again the reader makes the interconnection for himself. On the other hand, the *Cambridge Modern History,* another cooperative work, is highly arbitrary. The chief interest of the contributors is political history. There is no separate treatment of economic and social history; these are inserted into the various chapters of political history, and are distinctly subordinated as if they were branches of politics and legislation. The writers, one feels, neither care for economic or social history, nor do they know much about it. The chapters on literature or science or religion seem to be thrown in gratuitously as afterthoughts. A partial explanation of the difference between these two histories is that the *Cambridge History* appeared in the first decade of this century while the French work came two decades later.

There is another kind of disposition for relating cultural and economic history with political. Rather than treatment in separate chapters or sections, there is the method of interweaving the various histories more subtly, by shortening the various sections devoted to each history and including all of them in the same chapter. This can be done by refusing to postpone the social or cultural history until a distinct period in political chronology has been concluded. This kind of interweaving is more in keeping with "what actually occurred" because economic, social, intellectual, and cultural developments occur simultaneously with and sometimes dependent upon political developments. Most historians, however, are not sufficiently masters of disposition, or of the facts of the various histories, to be able to accomplish this blending. When historians treat social or cultural history in a political narrative they therefore prefer the method of arranging their material in large and unified blocks. Trevelyan's *English Social History* is, in a sense, a recognition that social history deserves specialized treatment, at the same time assuming a knowledge of political history and chronology on the part of the reader.

The Rise of American Civilization by Charles and Mary Beard is a supreme example of successful interweaving of the various phases of human activity. In the introduction the Beards say, "As long as the various divisions of history are kept separate, each must be incomplete and distorted." But to write a history of civilization that is organic in nature and not just another political narrative interlarded with poorly done

chapters on the other divisions of history, is difficult, and the Beards warn that many have tried and few succeeded. The Beards do succeed. Their history of the American people is well balanced and the parts are nicely blended and proportioned. The economic growth of America and the intellectual development of its people become organic parts of the larger evolution of American civilization and not isolated and irrelevant segments dumped into a political narrative.

On a smaller scale from the standpoint of the period covered, but in somewhat more detail, is the superb little book called *Victorian England, Portrait of an Age*, by G. M. Young. Mr. Young's intention is indicated in the title. Like the Beards and Trevelyan he knows his subject in detail. He assumes more blandly than they that the reader will know his political history. In fact, the book is difficult for one not well versed in the general history of mid-nineteenth century England. After reading it, and being amazed at Mr. Young's knowledge of his period, the reader is certain that if the author were suddenly transported to the England of which he writes, he could live and move among the Victorians with perfect ease, speaking to and being spoken to by all men of all classes and parts of England. The Beards present their material in subsections of chapters so that their arrangement still has a blocked aspect, although not a pronounced one. But Mr. Young's transitions are made from paragraph to paragraph instead of from section to section. The blending is therefore complete. I cannot resist a rather lengthy excerpt from *Victorian England* in order to illustrate not only the arrangement of material but the rhetorical device of allusion that Mr. Young uses to perfection:

> But all the while Industrialism had been coming over England like a climatic change; the French wars masked the consequences till they became almost unmanageable. It is possible to imagine, with Robert Owen, an orderly evolution of the rural village into the industrial township given the conditions which he enjoyed at New Lanark, a limited size and a resident, paternal employer. Belper under the Stutts, Bolton under the Ashworths, the cosy houses and flourishing gardens of South Hetton, to which foreign visitors were carried with special pride, the playing fields of Price's Candle Works, the Lancashire village where Coningsby met Edith, all have some affinity with the Owenite Utopia, bold peasants, rosy children, smoking joints, games on the green; Merrie England, in a word, engaged in a flourishing export trade in coal and cotton. But the possibility of a general development along these lines had already been lost in the change-over from water to steam power, in the consequent growth of the great urban aggregates, and the visible splitting of society, for which the Enclosures had created a rural precedent, into possessors and proletariat. The employers were moving into the country; their officials followed them into the suburbs; the better workmen lived in the better streets; the mixed multitude of labour, native or Irish, was huddled in slums and cellars, sometimes newly run by speculative builders, sometimes, like the labyrinth round Soho and Seven Dials, deserted tenements of the upper classes. In a well-managed village with a responsible landlord and active parson, with allotments for the men and a school for the children, the old institutions and restraints might still hold good; in a neglected village, and in that increasing part of the population which now lived in great towns, they were perishing. Off work, the men could only lounge and drink; the girls learnt neither to cook nor to sew. Lying outside the orbit of the old ruling class, neglected by their natural leaders, the industrial territories were growing up as best they might, undrained, unpoliced, ungoverned, and unschooled.[1]

These four historians have written the history of society better than most historians. Yet the conception of the inclusive history is an old one. Two centuries

[1] (London, 1936), pp. 22-23.

ago Voltaire wrote his *Siècle de Louis XIV* with the purpose, as he says in his introduction, of portraying, "not the actions of a single man, but the spirit of men in the most enlightened period there has ever been." With the same ambition, in the nineteenth century, T. H. Buckle set out to write a *History of Civilization in England* that should synthesize the great mass of historical materials already by then accumulated. What Buckle said of his task was essentially what the Beards said. "The unfortunate peculiarity of the history of man is, that although its separate parts have been examined with considerable ability, hardly any one has attempted to combine them into a whole, and ascertain the way in which they are connected with each other."

While most of Buckle's contemporaries were still concerned with political or institutional history, Stubbs, Freeman, Froude, Gardiner and the German historians who influenced the English, at least one of the historians of this period wrote history in the same spirit as Buckle, though unlike Buckle he was not searching for laws in history. W. E. H. Lecky wrote his *History of England in the Eighteenth Century* with the intention of telling about social, economic, religious and intellectual life as well as political, and though he required seven volumes for his history, he still had to suppress or condense much of the political and military history of the period. His treatment of the various histories, however, is not synthetic in the literal sense of the word, for he uses the methods of separate chapters for separate topics.

From this time forward, the need for other histories than the political was increasingly realized, and the development of the "New History" was steady.

III

There is a close relationship between the enlargement of the content of history, with its influence on the disposition of historical material, and the scope of historical works. As the materials for the writing of history continued to accumulate, and at an accelerated pace as the study of history became an academic discipline, and as the other histories were introduced, the physical problem of mastering such a mass of materials became overwhelming. The nineteenth century had seen history written in the grand manner. The major historians, English, German, French, and American embarked upon and completed multi-volumed histories. But by the twentieth century it was no longer possible for a sincere historian to undertake such a project as a many-volume history because he could not compass the tremendous quantity of material that existed. Hence the popularity of cooperative histories, wherein each volume or chapter is the work of a specialist, and the project is the product of the combined effort of specialists. The American Nation Series or the Yale Chronicles, the various Cambridge Histories, the *Histoire Generale* and others are evidences of the necessity for cooperative effort.

The specialist, therefore, could now write as a specialist, and the emphatic tendency to concentrate more and more narrowly had its effect upon the rhetoric of the historian. The nineteenth century historians wrote with sweep and grandeur because they were engaged in a mighty effort. The twentieth century historian writes in a cramped manner, befitting the specialist who never departs from his authority or his footnote. The representative historical production of the twentieth century, the monograph or the research article, has influenced

the rhetoric of historians. All of which suggests that rhetoric is directly affected by the scope of the work the historian undertakes to produce.

The short research article or monograph ordinarily follows a pattern of its own. It is highly factual and closely restricted by footnoting so that the writer is kept close to a literal prose style. Since the article will be read only by other specialists whose interest in the subject is so great that style is a matter of indifference, there is little effort made by the writer to develop an engaging style. Organization and arrangement is more important because the point of the article will be brought out more strikingly if the material is disposed in a fitting and relevant manner. The article or monograph is a straightforward production that seeks to elucidate the results of highly concentrated research upon a narrow and limited topic. The article, however, is not easy to write. Ordinarily much material has been accumulated in the course of the research, and the problems of selection of facts, relevance, arrangement, and condensation are important because of the limitations of space placed upon the writer. Frequently the article is the by-product of other research. In gathering material for a larger work, such as a biography, the historian is often able to draw out several articles from his accumulating note cards. The article, therefore, is perhaps the most completely objective kind of historical writing, and is usually written in the most dispassionate style.

Occasionally, however, interpretative articles or articles of synthesis appear. A famous example of the interpretative article that condensed vast research and much thought, and produced pregnant conclusions was Frederick Jackson Turner's "Significance of the Frontier in American History," presented in 1893. The article was essentially interpretative, and its great achievement lay in combining evidences not at all obscure to produce a reading of American history that would take account of the obvious (once it was pointed out) significance of the frontier. The article has an eloquence of simplicity in its style, and it rings not so much with purposeful persuasiveness as with a sincerity that in itself persuades. It seems to say: "This is what I believe," not, "This is what I want you to believe." The opening paragraph makes the extreme claim that "The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward, explain American development." The remainder of the article provides illustrations as evidence is marshalled to support the contention. Every serious student of American history knew many of the things Turner was pointing out as well as did Turner himself, but the arrangement of the material in a synthesized form produced a profound impression upon historians everywhere. The concluding sentence of the article leaves the reader in the realm of speculation. Says Turner, "The frontier has gone, and with its going has closed the first period of American history." The reader asks, "What now?"

A more recent article is a good example of the pedantic and laborious research that has produced so much solid factual material out of which more general histories are written. Reinhard H. Luthin's "Abraham Lincoln and the Tariff" appeared in *The American Historical Review* for July, 1944, and was subsequently lampooned in *The New Yorker*. The opening paragraph touches on the tariff controversy in American history and indicates the relevance be-

tween the general question of the tariff and Lincoln's career. The body of the article traces Lincoln's attitude and relationship towards the tariff question from the beginning of his public career to his death. The only rhetorical problem involved in the article seems to have been what to leave out—that is, which facts were most significant and revealing, which were less so, and how many of the second kind there was room for in the article. This article clearly illustrates a definite rhetorical pattern. It deals with a single topic within a narrow compass; it never strays from the literal fact of Lincoln and the tariff question. And it is an extreme example of a pious adherence to footnotes and a reluctance to be independent of authoritative citation or to assume that the reader (even of a professional journal) knows that in American history there was a tariff controversy at all. For example, the following statement in the article is buttressed by a footnote citation to eight different references: "The controversy between 'high-tariff' and 'low-tariff' groups has remained constant in American history."

The larger forms of historical expression, the biography or book-length study, make less extreme rhetorical demands. The historian can write more freely and has greater opportunity for stylistic performance. The need for compression and condensation is less urgent, and the problem of selection of facts presents fewer difficulties. Less immediately relevant materials can be included. Organization and arrangement, however, differ between the book and the article only in degree and not in kind.

A conspicuous difference between the history writing of our own day and that of the nineteenth century is in the striking paucity of multi-volume works produced by contemporary historians. The grand scale historians of the last century seem to reflect the leisure of that period as well as the lesser quantity of materials for writing history. As has been indicated, one explanation for the failure of contemporary historians to write large scale works is the over-abundance of historical materials through which the historian must sift and wade. The collections of specialized studies in the form of cooperative histories in many volumes lack the unity of such works as Green's *History of the English People* or McMaster's *History of the American People*. No editor can supply the internal cohesion to the products of various minds and pens that is evidenced in the work of one man.

There are, nevertheless, examples of the large scale project today. Arnold Toynbee's *A Study of History* is an undertaking more ambitious than anything Buckle contemplated.[2] Toynbee's work is devoted to a comparative study of civilizations, their rise, interrelationships and decline. It is more philosophy of history and philosophizing about history than narrative. Its organization and plan is as unique as it is ambitious, and Toynbee ranges far more widely in time and space than Spengler or Brooks Adams. The chronological range is all of human history and the special extent is the world. Each large subject such as the "genesis" of civilizations or the "disintegration" of civilizations is discussed by reference to various civilizations that have appeared and disappeared. Throughout the volumes extend the search for pattern and rhythm in history as guides for knowing why and how cer-

[2] This section on Toynbee was written before the "rage" for Toynbee following the articles about him in *Harpers* and *Time* and the appearance of the one volume condensation of *A Study of History*.

tain things happened in the past, and the insistence that the fullest understanding of history will be achieved by studying societies rather than city-states or nations. The rhetoric of the work, the selection of facts, the disposition of the evidence, and even the sweep and flow of its style are directly influenced by Toynbee's thesis that the "true concern" of history is "with the lives of societies in both their internal and their external aspects." Toynbee himself indicates the disposition of his materials. "The internal aspect is the articulation of the life of any given society into a series of chapters succeeding one another in time and into a number of communities living side by side. The external aspect is the relation of particular societies with one another, which has likewise to be studied in the two media of time and space."

Of quite a different scope, though of as many volumes, is another contemporary multi-volume project. Lawrence Henry Gipson is writing *The British Empire before the American Revolution*, of which the sixth volume appeared in 1946. His large purpose is to show in detail the nature of the British Empire, its organization and the interrelationship of its parts, and to present its history during the two decades immediately preceding the American Revolution, all as a means of contributing to a better understanding of the American Revolution. The range in time is clearly demarked, and the spatial extent, the British Empire, though vast, is also definite. The first three volumes are descriptive rather than narrative, showing the political, social, and economic structure of the Mother Country and the dependencies. The next three volumes are essentially narrative and therefore proceed chronologically as they take up the epic story of the struggle between France and England for imperial supremacy, yet they also contain long sections devoted to the descriptions of what Professor Gipson calls the "Zones of International Friction"—the areas wherein the direct clashes between England and France occurred.

This large project, which will only be concluded with the outbreak of the American Revolution, involves important rhetorical problems. Although the vast scale of the work leaves room for detailed treatment of many matters, there are still the problems of proportioning and arranging, of deciding what to treat first and what later, remembering the many volumes to be written. Something of the nature of this difficulty is admitted by Professor Gipson in the preface of his fifth volume. "In view of plans for the subsequent volumes, which will trace the fortunes of the Empire down to the outbreak of the American Revolutionary War, it appeared undesirable to give in the volumes now concluded much stress to certain topics such as British mercantilism and the trade and navigation system that supported it, which will be considered at length, as will likewise the diverse patterns of thought that motivated the English-speaking people in the eighteenth century and that were objectified in their culture—using the latter word in its larger connotation."

Yet, for all the preliminary planning as to organization and for all the opportunity for presentation of detail, modifications have to be made as the work progresses to maintain proportion and balance and to harmonize the separate topics with the project as a whole. The rhetorical problem of disposition is both mechanical and artistic. In the same preface, Professor Gipson says, "I

have been impelled through the need of economy of space to pass over some topics that I had planned to comprehend and in preparation for the inclusion of which I had gathered the materials." Whatever may be said about scientific method in the gathering of historical materials, writing and presentation involve the consideration of artistic and aesthetical qualities of proportion, harmony, and fitness. After naming a topic whose treatment he had to forego, Professor Gipson continues, "But this really fades into comparative insignificance when placed beside the struggle for the heart of the North American continent and for the control of the subcontinent of India. Therefore it was omitted in order to give adequate treatment of Anglo-French rivalry, which looms so large in the history of the old British Empire between the years 1748 and 1754." Disposition is made to conform to "what actually occurred."

Here one returns to Ranke. No historian will ever be able to relate "what actually occurred," for quite obvious reasons. The historian must discern leading forces, trends, and movements; he must distinguish in the light of subsequent events and in accordance with the climate of opinion of his own times what is important and what is not. Criteria and judgments of values will change from period to period in relation to the tastes and necessities of men in different eras. This is homage to "the principle of adaptation to need" in the Ciceronian sense.

IV

I have not sought to examine in detail the various rhetorical devices or individualities of style to be found in historical writing. The major concern has been to show the larger factors that affect especially the disposition of written history, and also to suggest that these factors may influence rhetorical artifice as well. These three major factors are purpose, content, and scope, all of which directly affect and sometimes determine the selection of facts, the organization, arrangement, shaping, proportioning, composing, and adapting the materials (disposition), and the manner of writing (style).

PUBLIC ADDRESS: A STUDY IN SOCIAL AND INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

ERNEST J. WRAGE*

IN the title of a book, *Ideas Are Weapons,* Max Lerner gives to ideas a twentieth century connotation, for in this century all of the resources of man have twice comprised actual or potential materiel of warfare. The merit of the title lies in the emphasis it places upon function, although one must read beyond it to grasp the diversity of function which ideas perform. Man's capacities for thought somewhat resemble modern industrial plants which are capable of converting raw materials into either soap or bullets, of refining sugar into nutritive food or into alcohol for the manufacture of explosives. Similarly, from the biochemical processes of individual minds responding to environment may emerge ideas which serve to promote social conflict, while there are yet others fortunately, which contribute to resolution of differences. Man's intellectual activities may result in ideas which clarify his relationships with his fellow men and to the cosmos, or in ideas which close minds against further exploration in favor of blind conformity to tradition and authority. It is axiomatic that the extant records of man's responses to the social and physical world as expressed in formulations of thought provide one approach to a study of the history of his culture. Whether we seek explanations for an overt act of human behavior in the genesis and moral compulsion of an idea, or whether we accept the view that men seek out ideas which promote their interests and justify their activities, the illuminating fact is that in either case the study of ideas provides an index to the history of man's values and goals, his hopes and fears, his aspirations and negations, to what he considers expedient or inapplicable.

The word *ideas,* therefore, is not restricted here to a description of the great and noble thoughts uttered by accredited spokesmen for the edification of old and young. It is employed in a more inclusive sense and refers widely to formulations of thought as the product and expression of social incentives, which give rise and importance now to one idea, then to another. They are viewed as the product of social environment, as arising from many levels of life, and as possessing social utility. Ideas are not here treated as entities which enjoy an independent existence and which serve as objects of contemplation by the self-avowed or occasional ascetic. While the history of ideas is undeniably concerned with major works in systematized thought, and with the influence of thinker upon thinker, exclusive devotion to monumental works is hopelessly inadequate as a way of discovering and assessing those ideas which find expression in the market place. Subtle intellectual fare may be very well for stomachs accustomed to large helpings of ideational substances rich in concentration; but there also is nutritional value in the aphoristic crumbs which fall into stomachs unaccustomed and unconditioned to large helpings of such fare, and the life sustained by the crumbs is not without historical interest. The force of Emerson's ideas upon the popular mind of his time, and even

*Assistant Professor of Speech, Northwestern University

later, derives less from his intricate elaborations upon man and the cosmos than from his dicta on self-reliance. Moreover, ideas arise at many levels of human life and find expression in and attain force through casual opinion as well as learned discourse; and while the life span of many popularly-held ideas is admittedly short, often these "out-of-the-way" ideas thrive and emerge at higher levels of development. This extension in the conception of the history of ideas which includes more than monumental distillations of thought in philosophy, religion, literature, and science may be offensive to those of fastidious intellectual tastes, but there is increasing awareness that adequate social and intellectual history cannot be written without accounting for popular opinions, beliefs, constellations of attitudes, and the like.

I

Ideas attain history in process, which includes transmission. The reach of an idea, its viability within a setting of time and place, and its modifications are expressed in a vast quantity of documentary sources. Man's conscious declarations of thought are embodied in a mosaic of documents, in constitutions and laws, literature and song, scientific treatises and folklore, in lectures, sermons, and speeches. Of these, not the least either in quantity or value, as Curti points out, are the lectures, sermons, and speeches:

> Historians of ideas in America have too largely based their conclusions on the study of formal treatises. But formal treatises do not tell the whole story. In fact, they sometimes give a quite false impression, for such writings are only a fraction of the records of intellectual history. For every person who laboriously wrote a systematic treatise, dozens touched the subject in a more or less casual fashion. Sometimes the fugitive essays of relatively obscure writers influenced the systematizers and formal writers quite as much as the works of better-known men. The influence of a thinker does not pass from one major writer to another without frequently being transformed or dissipated, or compressed in the hands of a whole series of people who responded to the thinker and his ideas. It is reasonably certain, moreover, that in the America of the early nineteenth century ephemeral writings, widely scattered as they were in pamphlets, tracts, and essays, reached a much wider audience and are often more reliable evidence of the climate of opinion than the more familiar works to which historians of ideas have naturally turned. The student of the vitality and modification of ideas may well direct his attention, then, toward out-of-the-way sermons, academic addresses, Fourth of July orations, and casual guides and essays.[1]

As a parenthetical comment, one recent study which makes extensive use of fugitive literature, particularly speeches, is Merle Curti's *The Roots Of American Loyalty,* published in 1946. But in the main, the rich vein of literature in speaking has hardly been tapped for this purpose except by the occasional prospector.

Curti's observations have germinal significance for the student of public address. They suggest an approach which is interesting for its freshness and fruitful in intellectual promise. If American life, to adopt his point of reference, is viewed through ideas historically viable, then ideas are to be studied as a body of intricate tissues, of differentiated yet related thought. While the establishment of macroscopic relationships provides the ultimate reasons for tracing out an American intellectual pattern, explorations of the parts is a necessary preliminary to this achievement. As an enterprise in scholarship, then, the first operation is one of collecting and classifying data within limited areas amenable to description and analysis. This accomplished, generalizations from the data

[1] Merle Curti, "The Great Mr. Locke: America's Philosopher, 1783-1861," *The Huntington Library Bulletin,* April, 1937, pp. 108-109.

become at once permissible and desirable, and provide a basis from which further exploration may be conducted.

It is at once apparent that the delineation of an American intellectual tradition calls for division of labor. It is not only the magnitude in task but diversity in data and in media of expression which invites specialization and varied technical skills in scholarship. There are, after all, appreciable and striking differences between the materials of hymnology and constitutional law. While students of philosophy, history, and literature are traditionally accredited as the official custodians and interpreters of intellectual history, it is the thesis of this paper that students of public address may contribute in substantial ways to the history of ideas. They possess credentials worthy of acknowledgment and interest in a type of materials germane to the object.

It has been amply treated and clearly said by others that the rhetoric of public address does not exist for its own sake, that its value is instrumental, and that its meaning apart from an application to something is sterile. An endorsement of this doctrine leads us to an immediate recognition that the basic ingredient of a speech is its content. The transmission of this content is its legitimate function. It is a vehicle for the conveyance of ideas. It is a mode of communication by means of which something of the thought of the speaker is incorporated and expressed in language in ways which make for ready comprehension and acceptance by one or more audiences. It is for the very reason that public speeches and lectures are prepared with a listening audience in mind that they serve so admirably in a study of social thought. The full import of this point is disclosed by some comparisons.

When reporting the results of work to members of his guild, the physical scientist may confine himself to an exclusive concern with data, intricate operations, and complex thought. In preparation and presentation neither detail nor comprehensiveness needs to be sacrificed, for his discourse is not prepared with an eye to the limiting factors present in the differentiated audience. As distinguished from this highly specialized form of reporting, a public speech is a more distinctly popular medium which is useful for explaining the essence of an idea, for explaining the applicability of a particular, for establishing impressions and evoking attitudes, for direction in the more or less common affairs of men. Because speeches are instruments of utility designed in the main for the popular mind, conversely and in significant ways they bear the impress of the popular mind. It is because they are pitched to levels of information, to take account of prevalent beliefs, and to mirror tone and temper of audiences that they serve as useful indices to the popular mind.

This interaction between the individual mind of the speaker and the collective mind of the audience has long been appreciated, but for the most part this interaction has been considered in terms of its relationship to the speaker's techniques. What has happened to the ideas themselves under the impact of this interaction remains a field which is relatively unexplored in any systematic sense by students of public address. The techniques of the speakers are often highly individualized and perish with their bones; their ideas live after them. From the study of speeches may be gained additional knowledge about the growth of ideas, their currency and vitality, their modifications under the impress of social

requirements, and their eclipse by other ideas with different values. Such a study of speeches belongs to what Max Lerner calls the "naturalistic approach" to the history of ideas, one which includes "not only the conditions of the creation of ideas but also the conditions of their reception, not only the impulsions behind the ideas, but also the uses to which they are put, not only the thinkers but also the popularizers, the propagandists, the opinion skill-groups, the final audience that believes or disbelieves and acts accordingly."[2]

Is not such scholarship properly confined to the professional historian? The question is dated and should be so treated. Squabbles over contested rights are hang-overs from an age of academic primogeniture. A study is to be judged by its merits, not by the writer's union card. But a more convincing argument for participation in scholarship of the history of ideas by students of public address is made apparent when we take another step in our thinking. The very nature and character of ideas in transmission is dependent upon configurations of language. The interpretation of a speech calls for complete understanding of what goes into a speech, the purpose of the speech and the interplay of factors which comprise the public speaking situation, of nuances of meaning which emerge only from the reading of a speech in the light of its setting. At this juncture a special kind of skill becomes useful, for the problem now relates directly to the craftsmanship of the rhetorician. The student who is sensitized to rhetoric, who is schooled in its principles and techniques, brings an interest, insight, discernment, and essential skill which are assets for scholarship in the history of ideas, as that history is portrayed in public speeches.

[2] Max Lerner, *Ideas Are Weapons* (1940), p. 6.

II

The prevailing approach to the history and criticism of public address appears to consist of a study of individual speakers for their influence upon history. If one may judge from studies available through publication, they fall short of that ambitious goal for reasons which are painfully apparent to anyone who has attempted to assess influence in history. Nevertheless, they do provide a defensible pattern in research which has yielded highly interesting data about prominent speakers, their speechmaking and speaking careers. Reference is made to this standard approach to public address simply as a means of establishing and clarifying some distinctions between it and the proposed method of study which concentrates upon the ideas in speeches. The differences are those of focus, of knowledge to be gained, and of procedure to be followed in investigation. While one approach is "speaker centered," the other is "idea centered." One focuses mainly upon the speaker and the speaking activity, the other upon the speech and its content. One seeks to explain factors which contributed to personal persuasion; the other yields knowledge of more general interest in terms of man's cultural strivings and heritage.

In point of procedure it should be at once apparent that there are differences involved in a study which centers, let us say, upon Henry Clay as an orator and in a study which centers upon the ideas embodied in his speeches on the American System. To pursue the example, a study of the ideas in Clay's speeches is not committed to searching out the sources of his personal power

with an audience, but is concerned with the doctrine of a self-contained economy as portrayed in his speeches in the perspective of that doctrine's history, from Hamilton to Matthew Carey's *Olive Branch*, to the congenial, nascent nationalism of Clay and contemporary speakers. Inasmuch as the American System is compounded of political and economic ideas, competence in handling the data of history is necessary; but it is also to be remembered that inasmuch as the ideas are projected through speeches, they are also the province of the rhetorician; that inasmuch as they are employed in speeches with the object of reaching and affecting a wide audience, the ideas are framed in a context of rhetorical necessities and possibilities. To adopt the rhetorical perspective is actually to approximate more closely a genuinely historical point of view when analyzing and interpreting speeches as documents of ideas in social history.

The possibilities for analysis in the rhetoric of ideas is illustrated in Roy P. Basler's essay on "Lincoln's Development As A Writer." The title of the essay should properly have included "And Speaker," for much of the brilliance of Basler's commentary arises from the treatment he gives the speeches.[3] Basler sets forth the basic ideas which are the essence of Lincoln's philosophy and links them to the dominant intellectual currents of Lincoln's age. He analyzes the rhetoric of Lincoln, not because he is interested in rhetoric *per se*, but because Lincoln's ideas were framed by his rhetoric, which, in turn, was profoundly affected by the exigencies present in the totality of social factors bearing upon the speaking situation. From an analysis of his rhetoric in this relationship, it is possible to come into a closer understanding of Lincoln's thought patterns and of the ideas he sought to lodge in the minds of his audiences. For instance, Basler recounts how the theme in the 'House Divided" speech was carried through many stages of inference, that it underwent many modifications in order to achieve the nuances and implications which Lincoln desired. Basler concludes that "It would be difficult to find in all history a precise instance in which rhetoric played a more important role in human destiny than it did in Lincoln's speeches of 1858."[4] He speaks, of course, of the instrumental role of rhetoric as it served to crystallize the meanings which Lincoln sought to convey. Through a masterful analysis of the rhetoric in the Gettysburg Address, Basler presents the underlying pattern of Lincoln's thought, as is suggested by a short excerpt from his treatment:

> Lincoln's problem at Gettysburg was to do two things: to commemorate the past and to prophesy for the future. To do these things he took the theme dearest to his audience, honor for the heroic dead sons and fathers, and combined it with the theme nearest to his own heart, the preservation of democracy. Out of this double theme grew his poetic metaphor of birth, death, and spiritual rebirth, of the life of man and the life of the nation. To it he brought the fervor of devoutly religious belief. Democracy was to Lincoln a religion, and he wanted it to be in a real sense the religion of his audience. Thus he combined an elegiac theme with a patriotic theme, skillfully blending the hope of eternal life with the hope of eternal democracy.[5]

A speech is an agency of its time, one whose surviving record provides a repository of themes and their elaborations from which we may gain insight into the life of an era as well as into the

[3] Roy P. Basler, *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings* (Cleveland and New York, 1946), pp. 1-49.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

mind of a man. From the study of speeches given by many men, then, it is possible to observe the reflections of prevailing social ideas and attitudes. Just as the speeches of Schwab and Barton, of Coolidge and Dawes (accompanied by the latter's broom-sweeping histrionics) portray the ethos of business and a negative view toward government intervention in social affairs, so do the speeches of Roosevelt and other New Dealers mark the break from the attitudes and conceptions which dominated the twenties. Both schools of thought express the social and economic values of the times. Both mirror the dominant moods of their respective audiences. The very structure, idiom, and tone of the speeches, moreover, play their parts in the delineation of those ideas. For example, the full import of Roosevelt's First Inaugural Address is not perceived without reference to the many nuances and imperatives of his rhetoric. It is in the metaphor of war and the image of the religious crusade, as well as in argument and statements of intention, that the speech articulates the inchoate feelings of the people on government's social responsibility. Similarly, from a wide investigation of sermons, lectures, and speeches related to issues, movements, and periods, might we not extend and refine our knowledge of social ideas portrayed in history? Such an attempt would constitute a kind of anthropological approach to a segment of cultural history.

III

Let the final argument be a practical one. Specifically, what applications may be made of this approach to public address in a university classroom? Experience has made it apparent to the writer that a course consisting only of successive case histories of individual speakers and speech-making leaves much to be desired. It certainly is open to question if an accidental chronology or arbitrary selection of orators provides a satisfactory focus and basic framework to warrant the label, "history of public address," or if it provides adequate intellectual and educational outcomes for the time expended. Interesting in its way as may be the study for its own sake of the personality, platform virtuosity, and career of an individual speaker, a mere progression of such more or less independent treatments is likely to be without secure linkage to historical processes. It is likely to result in an assortment of isolated, episodical, or even esoteric information which can make little claim to the advancement of the student's general culture.

There is more than a suggestion of antiquarianism in the whole business. We need, therefore, to provide a more solid intellectual residual. This may be realized when the focus of a course consists in the ideas communicated, in the ascertainable sources of those ideas, the historical vitality and force of the ideas, and of demonstrable refractions, modifications, or substitutions. As an adjunct to the materials of such a course, the study of the speaking careers and skills of individual speakers makes a valuable contribution. Such studies have supplementary value; but even more important is the study of the speeches themselves against a backdrop of history. Naturally, the exclusive study of speeches would result in historical distortion unless related to a larger framework of life and thought, to allied and competing ideas in the intellectual market place.

Seen against a broad and organized body of materials in intellectual and social history, the study of speeches both gives and takes on meaning in ways

which contribute substantially to educational experience. Especially helpful as leads in providing background are such familiar works as Vernon L. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought;* Merle Curti, *The Growth of American Thought;* and Ralph H. Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought,* to mention but a few. Such literature supplies references and guidance to the main lines of thought which underlie movements and problems in American life; it brings into view not only tributaries which fed the main streams, but also rivulets of ideas which had a kind of independent existence. Speeches may be studied in relation to these movements. For example, intellectual turmoil and diluvial expression were provoked by the slavery controversy. Antislavery appeals, historians tell us, were couched in the language of personal liberty and Christian humanitarianism. Proslavery speakers, forced to compete upon an equally elevated plane, advanced arguments which derived from similar or equivalent ethical bases but which were interpreted in ways congenial to Southern institutional life and practice. True, the rhetoric of ideas fails to account for all the forces at work; yet a wide reading in sermons, lectures, and speeches does bring one into a deeper understanding of the basic ideational themes, variations upon the themes, and the dissonance which were a part of the controversy and contributed to ultimate settlement. When seen against a contextual backdrop, speeches become at once a means of illustrating and testing, of verifying or revising generalizations offered by other workers in social and intellectual history.

There is an implied recognition in what has been said, of a deficiency in the scholarship of public address. There is need for an organized body of literature which places speeches and speaking in proper relationship to the history of ideas. Quite apart from reasons of classroom utility, research in the ideas communicated through speeches needs doing as a means of contributing to knowledge and understanding generally. Adequate social and intellectual history cannot be written without reference to public speaking as it contributed to the ideas injected into public consciousness. But if research is to move forward, perhaps the time has arrived to explore in our individual and joint capacities the rationale, procedures, and materials by which it may be carried on. To this end, a symposium of papers which deals with these problems would help to clarify and stimulate research in public address in its relation to social and intellectual history.

SOUTHERN ORATORY: A FIELD FOR RESEARCH

DALLAS C. DICKEY*

FOR approximately a half century a sufficient number of scholarly historians have studied and written in the field of Southern history to provide the present generation with a vast body of information. Historians, inspired by such men as Walter Lynnwood Fleming, William E. Dodd, and Ulrich B. Phillips, have been on the increase until within the last two decades such eminent scholars as E. Merton Coulter, Charles S. Sydnor, Wendell H. Stephenson Avery Craven, Bernard Mayo, Thomas P. Abernathy, Thomas B. Wertenbaker, the late Charles W. Ramsdell, and many others have produced solid studies in the field of Southern history. Practically all phases of Southern history have been the subject of their inquiries. The social and economic life of the Old South has been examined and surveyed in detail. The subject of slavery has received extensive investigation, and not the least of the concerns of these scholars has been the study of the attitudes of the antebellum planter toward the "peculiar institution." Naturally, much has been written about the causes of the Civil War, the political divisions and lines of demarcation prior to the conflict, the problems of the war and the reasons for the South's defeat, and the issues of reconstruction and the New South. Moreover, the production of biographies of Southern personages has not been neglected, so that the ever increasing output of them has served to acquaint readers with the names of men during the entire course of the history of the South.[1]

It requires no inconsiderable amount of time to master and appreciate the vast amount of Southern historical writing. Anyone who has tried to be aware and keep abreast of the bibliography will develop a genuine appreciation of how much it has grown and expanded. In addition to the research of the great body of scholars whose productions appear, for the most part, in full-fledged books, there are also the publications of the various historical society journals. The various states have developed some excellent journals, and particularly, *The Journal of Southern History*, the official organ of the Southern Historical Association, has exhibited the best in scholarly writing and editing.

I

Those of us in the field of speech interested in the careful study of Southern speakers and the issues with which they were identified are the heirs of much pioneer scholarship. Likewise, those who have worked in this field have been the recipients of all kinds of assistance and cooperation when it has become clear that we have incentives to scholarship and thoroughness. Probably the attitudes of southern historians towards us can be reduced to two inquiries: 1) Are you willing to become a critical and objective student of Southern history? 2) Will your research be a substantial contribution to the total body of knowledge which is being developed? Doubtless the sympathetic help of these scholars manifested toward the diligent and well-grounded student is matched only by their distrust and lack of confidence

*Professor of Speech, University of Florida.

[1] For an enlightening survey of Southern historical writing, see Wendell H. Stephenson, "A Half Century of Southern Historical Scholarship," *The Journal of Southern History*, XI, (February, 1945), 3-32.

toward those not inclined to do the thorough study which must characterize the scholar. A conclusion to be drawn is that the student of Southern public address must take for granted the necessity of becoming more than an amateur student of Southern history.

But historians cannot be expected to write a history of Southern oratory. They are, of course, considerably aware of the influence of certain eminent speakers and they use speeches and occasions for speechmaking of political leaders and others in reference documentations. Furthermore, historians are among the first to realize that Henry Grady, William Yancey, and L. Q. C. Lamar were most influential because of their speaking. No less do they attribute the influence of other men such as Alexander Stephens, Robert Toombs, and John Sharp Williams to their power in public address. But because the historian is concerned with other matters, the oratory of the *region* will be but touched upon. One example may illustrate the allied and yet different sources of interest of the historian and the oratorical critic. If, for instance, the historian is interested in treating the thinking of John C. Calhoun on nullification, he will turn first to Calhoun's Fort Hill Letter, and second to his speeches. The oratorical critic, on the other hand, will be concerned with the speeches of Calhoun on the same subject between the years 1830 and 1833, but will know, too, how much his ultimate thinking was clarified in his speaking because he wrote the Fort Hill Letter. The demand which we must make upon the oratorical critic is that he must know more history than we can expect the historian to know of oratory.

The field of Southern oratory is almost completely unworked, and offers great opportunities for the student of rhetorical history and criticism. If we are to have in our day a body of research on significant and influential speakers, we should not delay our activities. Nevertheless, the problem facing the student is where to turn and what to do. Guidance is essential, and years of reading and effort spent in understanding are necessary for maturity in outlook and insight. Those who guide must have been students themselves and should continue to work by example as well as precept. But while guidance is essential, the student must do his own work and become familiar with sources in libraries, archives, newspaper files, manuscript collections, court records, and diaries. Moreover, the South, like other regions in the United States, is large, and travel over great areas to specific repositories becomes necessary in this kind of research.

II

The pressing problems confronting the student are where to turn, what speakers to study, what issues and events can be explored to advantage, and what significant contributions will result when all efforts have been expended. It is in this period of orientation that guidance is so necessary. Ultimately one can see a problem clarify if sufficient time is spent so as to avoid rash undertakings. Some suggestions may be in order for those who may wish to identify themselves with this field of endeavor:

(1) There are opportunities in Southern oratory, as in all American public address, for research on outstanding speakers not yet studied. Only a beginning has been made. What has been done is good, but a limited number of studies on the doctoral level comprising work on Patrick Henry, William Yancey, Henry Grady, Henry Clay, Alexan-

der Stephens, John C. Calhoun, Seargent S. Prentiss, Pitchfork Ben Tilliam, and Benjamin Morgan Palmer just about completes the list.[2] These indivilduals were but a few of the southerners who spoke and influenced history. Other persons who will make rich research projects are James Madison, John Randolph, William C. Preston, Robert Toombs, Howell Cobb, Benjamin Hill, Henry Washington Hilliard, Robert Y. Hayne, Sam Houston, John J. Crittenden, Jefferson Davis, Zebulon Vance, L. Q. C. Lamar, John Sharp Williams, Huey Long, and Pat Harrison. Unquestionably all of these men were important figures in the life of the South as well as the nation.

(2) To no less an extent there exists an ever greater body of personages who may be somewhat more obscure, but, nevertheless, men of influence and ability. Some of them may belong in the first group mentioned above (if we insist on ranking speakers), and they are abundant. Only a few of them—statesmen, lawyers, and preachers—need be listed: George Poindexter, Henry S. Foote, Judah P. Benjamin, Rice Garland, David Yulee, Albert S. Pike, William Winans, James Henry Thornwell, Thomas Clingaman, Henry A. Wise, and Richard Menifee. Men do tend to become forgotten; hence, there is the need for students to place them in history. When it is once realized how much effective speaking has done by men in lesser situations in our national life, we see opportunities open up.

(3) General and specific periods and the special issues and events in southern history are available for study by the oratorical critic. Almost nothing is known of southern revolutionary oratory aside from what transpired in Virginia when Patrick Henry and his colleagues were on the scene. What were the utterances of men in Georgia and South Carolina? Likewise, nothing generally is known of the work of southern spokesmen in the ratification conventions of the Constitution. Again, what southern speakers aside from Patrick Henry and John C. Calhoun expressed themselves on the War of 1812? The same questions can be asked about southerners on the Compromise of 1820, and the tariff question from 1824 to 1833. Following 1830 southerners went more and more on the defensive in regard to slavery. The potential abolitionist in the south, angered by northern extremists, found exceedingly interesting justifications for the slave institution. Some oratorical critic and historian might well set for himself the task of portraying the public utterances of men on the issue. All was not said by Calhoun and Yancey. Others like Robert Barnwell Rhett and John A. Quitman had their audiences and inflamed the masses. The attitudes of southern spokesmen over a period of three decades, from 1830 to 1860, in which the speaking of all types of men, ranging from the most moderate to the extreme in fire-eating, would be a challenging undertaking. To no less extent, the speaking of southerners during the period of the Confederacy is open to

[2] Louis Mallory, "Patrick Henry, Orator of the American Revolution," University of Wisconsin, 1938; Rexford S. Mitchell, "William Lowndes Yancey: Orator of Southern Constitutional Rights," University of Wisconsin, 1937; Marvin Bauer, "Henry Grady, Spokesman of the New South," University of Wisconsin, 1936; Ernest J. Wrage, "An Investigation of the Speaking and Speeches of Henry Clay," Northwestern University, 1941; Nemias B. Beck, "The Oratory of Alexander H. Stephens," University of Wisconsin, 1937; Herbert L. Curry, "John C. Calhoun: Speaker," University of Iowa, 1941; Dallas C. Dickey, "Seargent S. Prentiss, Whig Orator of the Old South," Louisiana State University, 1938; Lindsey S. Perkins, "The Oratory of Benjamin Ryan Tillman," Northwestern University, 1945; Wayne C. Eubank, "Benjamin Morgan Palmer, A Southern Divine," Louisiana State University, 1943.

study. The speaking on issues confronting the Confederate Congress has never been touched upon by the students of American oratory; nor has there been any investigation of the speaking by men in and out of public life urging the southern people to continue the war. Likewise, the speaking of southerners on the problems of reconstruction is unknown except for that of a few men such as Grady and Lamar. Others did speak, but who were they and what did they say? An equally important field for investigation is the speaking of southerners on their own most difficult problem, namely, race relations. In spite of considerable superficial evidence to the contrary, many southerners have thought desperately hard on this question. The problem of education for the Negro and the concern of southern speakers regarding it would be a study in itself. In such a study the student will of necessity trace the spoken ideas of political figures, educators, ministers, and many classes of citizens.

(4) The history of public speaking in the various states is another field for study. The problem for the student is simply to select the state he wants to study and go to work. Admittedly, the study of public speaking in some states may be more interesting and profitable than in others; but enough has transpired in all of them, in certain periods particularly, to provide anyone with years of work. Some of the best states for study may be Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Texas. If the production by a given state of leading personages heightens the expression of ideas by others, then these states, seemingly the most active generally in southern history, may be of most interest to the student. Some of the southern states present peculiar problems. Why, for instance, has Louisiana never produced a political speaker of genuine note with the exception of Huey Long? Too, some of the southern states produced better speakers in an earlier period than in more contemporary times, and vice-versa. Mississippi produced almost more than her share of able speakers prior to the Civil War; and she need never apologize for such men as John Sharp Williams in the twentieth century, but she has been considerably impoverished in men noted for advanced thinking since his retirement from the United States Senate in 1923. Arkansas and Florida are worthy of study, but the names of James Fulbright and Claude Pepper are of especial contemporary significance.

(5) Preaching in the South will prove exceedingly interesting to the student of rhetorical history. Certain forces have operated to make it particularly so. First, the South, except for certain specific areas such as New Orleans and Mobile, has been overwhelmingly Protestant. Second, southern Protestant churches have tended, as a whole, to be ultra-conservative, fundamentalist, and evangelistic. The fact that the Southern Baptists far exceed in number the Northern Baptists is not without significance. Moreover, the evangelistic programs and activities of the various churches in the southern states in the early years of the nineteenth century was most phenomenal. The states of Tennessee, Kentucky, Georgia, and Alabama were probably the most fully covered by the circuit riding preachers and evangelists of any area in the South. Of still greater significance is the fact that the southern churches were compelled to take a stand on the slavery question before the Civil War, and proceeded to

sever themselves from northern or national church organizations. No issue or compulsive force of such magnitude could do otherwise than result in powerful pulpit utterances which shaped religious thinking. Southern church adherents who were slave holders had to make a decision. It was to defend the slave institution, and to justify it not only on social and economic grounds, but on religious as well. Separate southern church organizations came into being and continue to this day. The influence of southern preachers in shaping religious attitudes on church organization is a whole story in itself. Likewise, the problems presented by the defeat of the South in the war, the ever present issue of race relations and the reconciliation of the problem with theology and practical religion has been the concern of church spokesmen. The attempts at reunion of northern and southern church organizations, and the spoken feelings and thinking on both sides of the question need to be told. Mention has been made of the conservative and evangelistic nature of southern Protestant churches. This has had its result, and the present day reaction of untold numbers of southerners is that they continue to oppose reunion because of what they hold to be unwarranted liberalism in northern churches. Mass thinking is influenced by pulpit utterances. Consequently, the oratorical critic should understand this conservative reactionary pulpit attitude which is rather far removed from the concepts of a liberal social gospel. At the same time, the student will meet with numerous sincere and courageous pulpit thinkers who have been keenly aware of the acute and human problems of the South.

(6) A field completely unstudied in American public address, and one peculiarly significant in the South, is that of Negro speaking. It should not be forgotten that one of our greatest speakers, Booker T. Washington, was a Negro. Many intriguing questions arise such as who the most significant Negro speakers have been, how much Negro speaking has been done, what kind it has been, and the influence it has had. Every southern city, hamlet, and rural community has had Negro preachers of every denomination.[3] No less, the southern Negro institutions of learning have produced scholarly thinkers and spokesmen. The role of the southern Negro educators should not be overlooked. They have spoken on all phases of reform and on matters of intimate concern to their race. Not infrequently, too, they have appeared before white audiences. The quality of Negro speaking will be of special interest to the student. Inevitably the story of Negro speaking will range from the most unlettered and emotional variety to the logical, refined, and cultured; but the picture is unknown and should be portrayed.

(7) Contemporary southern speakers offer still another field for study. True, contemporary southern speakers vary widely in ideas, outlook, capacities, and methods from such men as Theodore Bilbo and Eugene Talmadge to James Fulbright, Ellis Arnall, and Claude Pepper. Most that is demagogic and reactionary in some is offset by others with the liberalism and forthright courage to champion immediate and long-range reforms. Moreover, spokesmen of note in the South are not limited to those in statescraft. In other areas such as religion, reform, and education, southerners

[3] As an example of one study on Negro preaching, see: William Harrison Pipes, "Old-Time Negro Preaching: An Interpretative Study," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXXI (February, 1945), 15-22.

are being heard and respected. The South has today a Frank Graham in education, just as it had an Edwin Alderman in an earlier time. Likewise, the South has some notable preachers in the contemporary scene. While the conservative and narrow sectarianism of the South has impeded needed religious utterances of a more forward looking nature, one is impressed also with the social consciousness of numerous southern pulpit voices. Many are reformers in their preaching, and are seeking to direct the thinking of their hearers on such problems as race relations. The race problem is, in final analysis, an issue which southerners themselves must meet and solve. Slowly currents of thought and points of view change. Very likely the student of rhetorical history, as he studies the present day issues discussed by spokesmen, will be impressed with signs of broadened outlook of contemporary spokesmen.

The above areas for research are only suggestive, and are by no means exhaustive. That a great number of subjects and problems exist for the rhetorical critic is apparent. The first important consideration is to become grounded and familiar with the history of the South, and then to proceed to the selection of a problem which lends itself to profitable study.

THE TRADITION OF RHETORIC

W. M. PARRISH*
University of Illinois

Students of rhetoric who are familiar with the tradition represented by Aristotle and Whately sometimes wonder at its deterioration to what Professor I. A. Richards calls "the dreariest and least profitable part of the waste that the unfortunate travel through in Freshman English! So low has rhetoric sunk," he adds, "that we would do better just to dismiss it to Limbo than to trouble ourselves with it."[1]

Whatever may be our attitude toward the recent deviation of rhetoric from its earlier course we need not share Professor Richards' contempt for the result. Modern teachers of English have had to adjust themselves to the progressive (or regressive) immaturity of college students and fill in the gaps created by the neglect of language study in the lower schools. To trace the course of this deviation might be a profitable task for some graduate student. All I shall attempt here is to "open and stir the earth a little" around this topic and suggest some implications for teachers of speech.

I

Current textbooks in "rhetoric" for English classes contain very little that Aristotle would identify as rhetoric. While some of them, though fewer than in former years, still retain, if only in part, the title of rhetoric, their content is drawn almost entirely from the fields of grammar and poetic. They contain nothing comparable to Aristotle's analysis of motives and emotions and types of character. It is only in the realm of style, where rhetoric blends with grammar and poetic, that some vestiges of the original Aristotelean content remain. Representation of persuasion as the central motive of discourse is conspicuously absent. Examination of four textbooks in English composition published, or republished, within the current year reveals that in only one of them is persuasion treated, and in this one it receives a scant twenty lines. Indeed the purposes of composition in general are given but little attention. While the four forms of discourse that became standard during the nineteenth century—description, narration, exposition, and argumentation—are still treated, they seem often to be treated merely as forms, not as purposes. In spite of the recent rediscovery by some teachers of English that communication is the purpose of nearly all writing, there is little attempt to have the student fit his composition to the reader, and one suspects that in general the objective of the theme-writer is merely to suit the whims of his teacher. Discussions of usage, choice and arrangement of words, construction of sentences and paragraphs supply the bulk of the content.

In these books one will search in vain for any reference to the writers on rhetoric in earlier times. Whatever the sources from which materials are drawn Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian are not among them. Campbell, Blair, and Whately seem not to have been consulted. Nor is there any reference to more recent rhetoricians such as A. S. Hill, Genung, and Baldwin, who seem to have set the pattern for the modern teaching of English composition. It is difficult to believe that any modern work in composition can be purely empirical—com-

*Professor of Speech, University of Illinois.
[1] *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1936), p. 3.

posed in an academic vacuum, but apparently these modern authors have either ignored or repudiated the two-thousand-year tradition which nourished them. It is significant also that the word *rhetoric* has almost ceased to be used as the title of courses in freshman English.

II

If we look backward a few years we find that the loss of contact with the ancient tradition is comparatively recent. Quackenbos, in his *Advanced Course of Composition and Rhetoric* (1854), shows acquaintance with Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian and defends his treatment of written, as well as spoken, composition on the ground that even Aristotle's *Rhetoric* comprehended both. A. S. Hill's *Principles of Rhetoric* (1878) introduces a chapter on persuasion into his discussion of argument and reveals familiarity with Campbell, Whately and Bain as well as with the ancients. His later *Foundations of Rhetoric* (1892), however, treats only of words, sentences, and paragraphs. Genung's *Practical Elements of Rhetoric* (1886) adds persuasion to the standard four forms of discourse. And C. S. Baldwin's *A College Manual of Rhetoric* (1902) makes a clean separation of logical composition (exposition and persuasion) from literary composition (narration and description) and shows throughout familiarity with the classics.

But we must not assume that modern English textbooks represent a clean break from a clear and continuous tradition. If we seek to discover a single villain who diverted the stream of rhetoric from its former course, we will not find him. The stream arose before Aristotle's day, and he is not its source. It is broad and has many channels. While his contribution to it was substantial it did not in his day dominate the stream, as it does not now. He refers in his *Rhetoric* to various of his predecessors and contemporaries whose conception of rhetoric was different from his. It is likely that the sophistic teachings of Gorgias, Isocrates, and Protagorus were more pervasive and influential in ancient Greece than the sounder and more philosophical work of Aristotle. Cicero and Quintilian carried on the Aristotelean tradition in Rome, though in somewhat diluted form. But in the later years of the Roman Empire, and throughout the Middle Ages sophistic was dominant. Not that the influence of Gorgias and Isocrates was directly felt, for, as Baldwin says,[2] "The conception animating the practice and the teaching of sophistic, far from being limited to antiquity, is medieval as well, and modern. Apparently it is permanent. Rhetoric is conceived by Aristotle as the art of giving effectiveness to truth; it is conceived alike by the earlier and the later sophists and by their successors as the art of giving effectiveness to the speaker." We should remember also Paul Shorey's acid comment: "Florid ornament is an instinct of human nature on a certain level of culture;" the flamboyant style "is merely the expression of the sophomoric taste of the natural man."[3]

Revelatory of the position of rhetoric in the late middle ages was its frequent personification in picturesque allegories "never as being engaged in any useful occupation, but as adding beauty, color, or charm to life."[4] She paints and gilds the pole of the chariot of Prudence, she clothes speech with beautiful colors, her

[2] Baldwin, C. S., *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic* (1928), p. 3.

[3] "What Teachers of Speech May Learn from the Theory and Practice of the Greeks," *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*, VIII (April, 1922), 110.

[4] See D. L. Clark, *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance* (1922), p. 47.

tongue is sugared by the honey sweet of Calliope. Clark finds Stephen Hawe's *The Pastime of Pleasure* (1506) typical of the period:

> The poem records the experience of Grande Amour, who, accompanied by two greyhounds, seeks knowledge. After visiting Grammar and Logic in their rooms, he goes upstairs to see Dame Rhetoric. Rhetoric sits in a chamber gaily glorified and strewn with flowers. She is very large, finely gowned and garlanded with laurel. About her are mirrors and the fragrant fumes of incense. Grande Amour asks her to paint his tongue with the royal flowers of delicate odors, that he may gladden his auditors and 'moralize his literal senses.'[5]

The recovery of classical learning in the renaissance helped to restore this painted hussy to useful service in society. The works of Melanchthon, Erasmus, Cox, Wilson, and Bacon represent rhetoric as concerned again with urgent public affairs and reveal familiarity with some or all of the great classical rhetorics.

III

But this escape from sophistic, from exclusive preoccupation with style and confusion with poetic, was neither complete nor lasting. After the middle of the sixteenth century the influence of Peter Ramus and his friend and champion, Omer Talon, corrupted again the classical tradition. Perry Miller has shown how pervasive and how powerful was this influence in the study and teaching of rhetoric in seventeenth century New England.[6] "Ramus," he says, "reformed the art of rhetoric by the simple act of amputating the sections on invention, disposition, and memory. Thus he threw the venerable six parts of the oration into the waste-basket, abolished all definitions of types, relegated discussion of the passions to physics and ethics, and left as the legitimate field of rhetoric merely the departments of elocution and pronunciation." In the Ramist theory content was all important, but it was supplied by logic—or by theology. Rhetoric was concerned primarily with style, "and style was an afterthought, a minor consideration, a drapery, something extra, and discrete, not the essence. Rhetoric supplied only the final touches, the last graces of speech and delivery which were useful and which were not to be contemned, but which nevertheless were mechanical additions, affixed here and there like spangles or gems."[7]

Those familiar with the eighteenth century rhetorics of Campbell and Blair may find in them a persistence of the Ramian influence, and doubtless it is still operative in our time and may be partly responsible for the neglect of invention and the preoccupation with style in the current teaching of English composition.

But at no time did the Ramian view dominate the field, and it does not now. In any democratic society when discussion is free and audiences vote there will be a need for an urgent rhetoric of persuasion. The Aristotelean tradition was again poured into the stream in 1828 with the appearance of Whately's *Elements of Rhetoric*. For nearly a century its influence was enormous, a new edition being published in America as late as 1890.[8] And in our century as teachers

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

[6] *The New England Mind* (1939), Chap. XI.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 326.

[8] Richards' contempt for Whately, *op. cit.* pp. 7-8, is more than a little puzzling and will not be shared by most of us. "What we are given by Whately," he says, "is a very ably arranged and discussed collection of prudential rules about the best sorts of things to say in various argumentative situations, the order in which to bring out your propositions and proofs and examples, at what point it will be most effective to disparage your opponent, how to recommend oneself to the audience, and like matters. As to all of which, it is fair to remark, no one ever learned them from a treatise who did not know about them already; at the best, the treatise may be an occasion for realizing that there is skill to be developed in discourse, but it does not and

of English abandoned the classical tradition the teachers of speech revived it. Phillip's *Effective Speaking* (1908) and Winans' *Public Speaking* (1915) mark a clear return to the rhetoric of cogency and their influence is apparent in nearly all of the more recent books in our field.

IV

English teachers, as suggested above, have almost abandoned the very name of rhetoric, and the classical tradition is now completely in our hands. As we contemplate its long history and note the many deviations and corruptions of it we should be on guard lest it be again diverted from its proper channel. In current textbooks on speech there is no discoverable tendency to diverge again into sophistic so far as style is concerned. In teaching delivery, however, there is a constant temptation to encourage exploitation of the speaker at the expense of his message, and this, as Baldwin says, is the essence of sophistic. There is danger, too, that the rhetoric of persuasion may be watered down by excessive preoccupation with the physiology of breathing, techniques of discussion, the psychology of stage fright, the jargon of semantics, etc. But a constant corrective of this tendency is ever present in the urgent need for persuasion in current social and political situations. A further corrective might be sought in the thorough indoctrination of every teacher of speech with the rhetoric of Aristotle.

cannot teach the skill. . . . When he proceeds from these large-scale questions of the Ordonnance of arguments to the minute particulars of discourse—under the rubric of style—the same thing happens. Instead of a philosophical inquiry into how words work in discourse, we get the usual postcard's-worth of crude common sense:—be clear, yet don't be dry; be vivacious, use metaphors when they will be understood, not otherwise; respect usage; don't be long-winded, on the other hand don't be gaspy; avoid ambiguity; prefer the energetic to the elegant; preserve unity and coherence. . . . I need not go over to the other side of the postcard. We all know well enough the maxims that can be extracted by patient readers out of these agglomerations and how helpful we have found them!"

GOALS, OBSTACLES, AND PROBLEM FORMULATION IN GROUP DISCUSSION

JOHN W. KELTNER*

ONE phase of the discussion and problem-solving process which needs study and development is the problem itself. I wish here to suggest a method of *recognizing* and of *formulating* problems as a way of improving discussion.

It is evident that before we solve a problem, we must recognize it. Yet in group discussion, mere recognition of a problem is not enough. We must be able to phrase the problem in language that is descriptive and negotiable. Probably one of the reasons for our failure to deal with social problems is that we are unable to see them clearly as problems. We need to know how to get down to the "grass roots" of disturbances affecting our living. We must discover a way to arrange the events and reactions around us in negotiable language on the implicative level of thinking so that action may be more easily determined and carried out. One way to do this is to develop greater skill in recognizing and formulating problems.

Aids to Recognizing and Formulating Problems

Five operations or aids that seem to assist in the clarification and formulation of problems were developed in a recent experimental study:[1] (1) Know the nature of the things involved in your "problem-situation." (2) Determine your goals in the situation. (3) Find the obstacles to these goals that are apparent to your "problem-situation." (4) Determine where you stand in relation to your goals and the obstacles. (5) Avoid the common inhibitors to clear thinking. All five of these aids are important and must be used if we are to understand and apply the method of problem-formulation described in the following sections.

(1) When a problem occurs there are at least three things involved: (a) the goal toward which we are striving, (b) obstacles that prevent us from achieving that goal, and (c) our "state of achievement" or present degree of success or failure in reaching our goals. A "problem-situation" may be described as a *condition* involving the inhibition or obstruction of our desires or habits. The situation results in general disturbance and discomfort until it is removed.

Our problems will be partially recognized, therefore, when we see that some *wish* or *goal* that we are striving for is thwarted or inhibited. When we recognize that something, somebody, or some idea prevents us from reaching a goal we begin to recognize the problem involved. We must not assume, however, that merely seeing such obstacles is seeing the problem. One of the greatest dangers to clear problem-recognition and formulation is an inability to see and identify our goal and where we now are in relation to that goal. The presence of an obstacle which operates to prevent a goal from being reached is only a *part* of the situation. No problem can be fully recognized until we are able to see, understand, and distinguish *all three things*. We may phrase these as: Where do we want to go or what do we want? Where are we now? What is preventing us from going

*Assistant Professor of Speech and Director of Debate and Discussion, Iowa State Teachers College.

[1] Keltner, John. "An Experimental Study of the Nature and Training of Skill in Problem Recognition and Formulation for Group Discussion." Doctor's dissertation, Northwestern University, 1947.

where we wish, getting what we want, or continuing on our habitual way?

Our first requirement, therefore, is to recognize that each problem involves these three basic elements and that problem-solving can rarely proceed very far until all three things are clear to us.

Problems in general may arise from three types of situations that have bearing on the goals we seek: (a) The "forked-road" situation, (b) the "assimilation" situation, and (c) the "objective" situation.

The "forked road" situation arises when we are faced with making a choice between two things. The "assimilation" situation arises when we desire to bring something into our control, i. e., the acquisition of knowledge, the collecting of ideas, etc. The "objective" situation arises when we wish to move in the direction of something that is basically concerned with immediate action.

(2) Because goals, habits, etc., are vital parts or agents in any problem, we must discover just what goals, aims, habits, etc., are operating in our "problem-situation."

We have many goals or drives. Not all are alike nor do they come from the same sources. Our objectives are either directly or indirectly the result of the basic drives or reaction tendencies that we have developed as a result of our nature and envioronment. Most of our goals come from such drives as self-preservation and security, regeneration, self-advancement, desire for new experiences, and desire to help others. These have often been called "motivations" and influence the choice and evaluation of the specific goal or objectives toward which we strive in any problem-situation. In the analysis of a problem, therefore, it becomes necessary to engage in careful self-analysis to discover just what we want and the basic drive responsible for this desire.

Habits also are important to consider when we are setting goals in a "problem-situation." Habits, or predispositions to perform certain acts in oft-repeated ways, have arisen from our past experience as we have tried to reach or satisfy the basic drives. They may often consist of those patterns of action that have in the past been somewhat successful in satisfying the drives. We often lose sight of our basic drives and goals in the welter of habits that we develop to reach these goals. In these cases the mere activity in the "old familiar fashion" provides a degree of satisfaction even though it may not reach the goal we basically desire. This is dangerous when we stop with the superficial satisfaction short of our real goal. On the other hand, habits may often provide acceptable pathways to our goals and then should be valued and maintained.

A problem may arise, therefore, when we discover that a particular habit fails to satisfy the goal or basic drive that we have in the given situation or when it takes us to a goal that is removed from our desire in the given situation. A problem may also arise when some event or thing inhibits and disturbs our habitual way of action. We must then find some other way to reach our goal.

Goals, then, are to be determined by an analysis of our basic drives and the habits involved in satisfying these drives. Each situtation may have its own peculiar goal or goals that are rooted in basic motivations and habits. Hence, we must locate and formulate the particular goal after we have determined the basic drive in the situation. This phase of thinking should be respected early in analyzing a problem.

(3) When we have located and clarified our goals we must then locate the

inhibitors or obstacles which in this situation prevent us from reaching our goals. Obstacles, in general, are those things, ideas, persons, habits, ways of thinking and the like that have occurred and are occurring to disrupt and prevent us from satisfying our objectives.

We too often begin and end so-called problem-solving with a consideration of obstacles. The traditional "gripe-session," the chronic "we view with alarm" attitude, and the over emphasis on errors and difficulties is typical of such inadequate problem-solving. Many of us dwell at length on our difficulties, disregarding their meaning or relation to our goals, and fail to reach solutions. Such is a common error in our thinking today. Nevertheless, although it is easy to let the gripe session run too far, the location and description of obstacles to thought must be undertaken in the beginning stages of problem-solving.

(4) The last immediate task in our problem-formulation method provides the connecting link with the analysis of the problem and its development. This job is similar to that of determining the traditional "status of the case" in demonstrative thinking, and it can be brought to a focus by such questions as these: How vital is the "problem situation"? What part of it is of *immediate* importance? How far have we already progressed in eliminating our difficulties? What still remains to be done in order to solve or eliminate the "problem-situation"?

When we can answer these questions and when our goals and obstacles are clearly before us we will be moving directly toward the solution of our problem. The "status" stage performs a very important job of leading us into a careful and pertinent analysis and judgment that has traditionally been a part of the "analysis phase" of reflective thinking. To ignore this last step would cause some difficulty in bridging the gap between the processes of formulation, analysis, and solution.

(5) The whole process of problem-solving, as well as the particular steps involved, may be obstructed or prevented by various factors commonly called "inhibitors." Three in particular seem to be vicious and persistent opponents to clear thinking and clear recognition of problems.

The lack of sufficient knowledge or understanding to enable us to see the elements of our problem. That is, we must know something about the proper operation and function of our automobile before we can recognize that when a cylinder does not fire there is something wrong. In other words, *we must know what we want.*

Inadequate challenge or stimulus sufficient to goad us into thinking. If we are not sufficiently concerned with the proper operation of our auto and if the loss of power is not very great, we do not have adequate stimulation to act. But when the car won't climb a hill on an urgent mission we suddenly are aware of a problem that we should have noticed sooner had we been properly challenged. In other words, we must be able to *recognize what is in our way* as soon as it appears.

Physical and mental inhibitors that are habits through nonreflective thinking. Suppose that we are habitually procrastinators: we would probably put off an investigation or a check until the machine stopped entirely. The example may seem exaggerated; yet many of us commit this very error in relation to our personal and social problems. In other words, we must *be sensitive to the "problem situations" around us.*

In problem-solving, then, as long as we have not set our goals we will wander

aimlessly among the difficulties. If we have a goal but are not able to achieve it because of obstacles not removed, we are affected emotionally. Our body tensions are increased and we feel an urgency to act, but have no direction. As long as we move along in our customary and habitual pattern and so long as these patterns are sufficient to meet the demands of life there is no occasion for thinking. Unless we are faced with a situation that demands an adjustment to the difficulties or obstacles preventing us from reaching certain goals we do not engage in what is usually termed thinking.

When a problem situation arises we are disturbed with doubts, uncertainty, and irritation. If we have no satisfactory habit that will solve that problem automatically we are forced to bring the problem to the center of our attention. These feelings, then, are the precipitating elements of thinking and catalysts to problem-solving. When bafflement and its concomitant emotional disturbance affects us we begin to *search* for ways of eliminating it. This *search* is the essence of thinking. Our aim here is to describe a method of locating and formulating the direction that this search should take.

The first essential, then, in the formulation of a problem or a question that may represent a problem is *the possession of a goal* in the form of a drive, a purpose or an *end-in-view*. The second essential is to *have a familiarity with the situation in which the obstacle or obstacles to this goal arise and to see the relationship of the obstacles to the goal and to the situation in which we find ourselves.* The third essential is thoroughly *to understand where we are in relation to our goals and in relation to the obstacles.*

Application in Discussion

In applying the five aids to the effective formulation of a problem, it is useful to proceed from two points of view: What can be done *prior* to the discussion by the members of the discussion group and what can be done *during* the discussion by the members of the group? The processes of recognizing and formulating problems usually occur during the first two divisions of Deweys' plan of thinking: the location and definition step and the analysis step. Accordingly, we begin our thinking with a *hypothesis* of the problem in terms of a tentative formulation and as our thinking progresses we *revise* that hypothesis until the problem and its elements become clear and suggest rather definite criteria for a plan of action. Then we are ready to move into the third phase of the thinking process, the proposed solution stage. We will not be too greatly concerned with that stage in this paper inasmuch as it lies outside the immediate recognition and formulation of the problem.

Steps Prior to Discussion:

(1) *Determine the nature of the topic or material that represents the subject to to be considered.* The following questions will aid in this process. (a) Does this topic or material represent an *objective* or a *goal* to be achieved in this situation? (b) Is this topic or material a statement of an obstacle or an explanation of some factor which prevents the realization of some goal? (c) Is this topic or material a statement of a *solution* or a method of overcoming some obstacle and of achieving some objective?

(2) *Classify all related facts, opinions, judgments, etc., that are derived from your reading experience into three categories:* (a) List all you know about a given topic or problem-situation under the three categories: goals or objectives;

obstacles; solutions or methods. (b) *As you study* the topic, list each item of information under that category which most accurately describes the nature of the information. (c) check your lists to be sure that you have accurately classified all the material collected.

(3) *Determine what you consider the major objective or general goal in this problem-situation to be.* (a) Check over the objectives you have listed from your reading and thinking. (b) Mark all those obectives which appear to be major ones (or goals that represent a final single achievement) with a number "1." (c) Mark all those objectives which appear to be goals which are necessary in order to achieve the major objective with the number "2." (d) Review the major objectives that you have marked "1" and eliminate all those that you believe to be irrelevant to this situation, beyond the scope of the discussion being planned, etc. (e) From the remaining major objectives choose the one that you believe to be the most practical in this situation. Then rephrase it to make it more understandable to the members of your group. The following phrases may be helpful in opening the statement: To acquire . . .; To achieve . . .; To permit . . .; To prevent . . .; To discover . . .; To determine . .; etc. (This goal or objective as phrased may be placed at the top of a clean sheet of paper which we will call the "Formula Sheet.")

(4) *Determine what you consider your specific, minor, or enabling objective to be.* (a) Return to your original list of objectives and review those objectives that have not been marked as major objectives. (b) Eliminate those goals or obectives that do not lead to or result in the achievement of the major goal or objectives. (c) Rephrase the remaining goals as it is necessary to make them clear and negotiable in discussion. (These goals may then be placed at the bottom of the paper called the "Formula Sheet.") *They are to be preceded by the phrase, "as shown by."*

(5) *Determine the obstacles that seem to prevent your achieving your major or any of your minor objectives.* Return to the sheet on which you have classified the material you have collected. [See item (2).] For each of the obstacles that you have listed there (and you may by this time wish to add more that did not appear in your thinking when you began the list) determine the following things: (a) The cause of this obstacle or maladjustment; (b) the relative importance of the obstacle to the achievement of the major objective; and (c) the relative permanency of the obstacle or maladjustment. Then list these obstacles as short statements in the center section of the "Formula Sheet": Precede them with the phrase, "by removing such obstacles as:"

You now have on a single sheet (or maybe two, not more) a complete brief of the problem situation you are considering. We may call this a Complete Formulation. It is, however, a *tentative* formulation. Added research and discussion will improve and change the general nature of that formulation. Yet for the purposes of beginning the discussion and of directing further research on the topic you now have a clear statement of a general objective, of specific goals that will bring you to that objective and of the obstacles that seem to be preventing the realization of any or all of these goals. You are now ready to enter the discussion.

Steps During The Discussion

It is extremely important to remember that *the formulation should be made as soon as is possible during discussion.* This will enable your group to make a more concentrated and effective attack

on the development of a solution. The following procedure may suggest a method for handling this phase of the discussion:

A. *Relate the topic of your discussion to the phase of reflective thinking in which it belongs.* (It is obvious that topics for discussion are rarely stated as problems. They often appear as propositions, or solutions, or as obstacles, or as isolated facts in a situation. It is the responsibility of the group to locate just where the topic as stated appears in the stages of reflective thought and to move in the direction necessary to attack the problem effectively.)

B. *Agree on a tentative complete formulation.* Require each member of the discussion group to present the formulation he arrived at during the preparation period. Alter and combine the formulations until you have reached a cooperative statement that will operate in your discussion. Stay with the formulation step until you are able to state the goals and obstacles in clear and concise terms.

C. *Your group may now proceed to the solution of the whole problem.* The following procedure is suggested as being helpful: (1) Analyze all the major factors relating to the problem, such as the causes of the obstacles, the effects of their being, the relation of the obstacles to the goals of the group, etc. (2) Change the formulation of the problem *if* discussion shows that such is necessary in order to get at the heart of the situation. (3) Add to the list of specific objectives or goals any additional *criteria* that your analysis may bring to light. (4) State and describe any *method* that may provide the things that are required by the objectives. (5) Evaluate these proposals by determining their adequacy in terms of the objectives and criteria that have been developed. (6) Retain those solution-proposals that will lead either partially or wholly to the objectives. (7) Bring together all these methods into a single and detailed *plan of action* that will achieve the objectives formulated in your problem statement. (8) Summarize the discussion by stating the complete problem-solving procedure, including the following things: the complete formulation, the specific criteria that were added, the analysis and evaluation of the obstacles, and the final solution-method agreed upon by the group.

This procedure should be recognized as being suggestive; it is not to be used as a hard formula *imposed* on your discussion. Its purpose is to *facilitate* thinking. When discussion bogs down in the mechanics of the situation, the formula can be discarded although its principles should be observed. The leader, in preparing for the discussion, may wish to rework the proposed pattern and bring it into the discussion in the form of questions that will draw forth the essential materials in the problem.

We can all be concerned with improving and sharpening our techniques of problem-solving. The method herein described represents an attempt to clarify and improve the first step in reflective thought, that of discovering and stating the essentials of the problem itself. The method is also valuable in personal as well as group problem-solving. It has even proved effective in directing graduate research.

READING THE LANGUAGE OF LITERATURE

LORRAINE NAUSS*

IRWIN EDMAN tells the story of a pianist who played a Beethoven sonata to a small audience. When he had finished, one of the women in the group said she liked his playing, then added, "But the sonata what does it mean?" The pianist could give her no answer but to play it over again. What answer should you have given the woman?

Suppose a student in an oral interpretation class should ask you what a literary composition "means," what should you do? Should you read it for him, yourself participating in the imaginal situation as the author prompts you, so that the student empathizing in your participation, also has an adequate response to the selection? Or should you try to paraphrase its content, thinking that, after all, language is the "expression of thought by means of speech sounds," and that if the thought is not so clearly expressed by the author's language, another set of words can say the same thing? Or if not *exactly* the same thing, at least an approximation of the *logic* of the selections? Would you then go on to say that the emotional elements can later be sought out in the sounds and images which the author uses, and so the two (logic and emotion) can be added together to arrive at the sum total of "meaning?"

These two assumptions (often, perhaps, unconscious) underlying so much classroom analysis of poetry, should be seriously questioned by teachers of speech. I wish to present a theoretical basis for such criticism, in the proposition that the literary use of language is far different from what we call "expression of thought," that the logic and the emotion of an art experience cannot be separated from each other or from actual participation in the action which the author himself suggests through—and only through—his own symbolism.

*Miss Nauss has been a teacher of speech at the University of Minnesota and the University of Illinois. She now teaches English at Roosevelt College, Chicago.

I

Of course we cannot actually dichotomize language usage: even the uses we might consider polar extremes, the literary and the scientific, cannot be arbitrarily divided from each other. We might, however, think of them as being divergent in direction, ranging from formulae of *particular processes* of experience to formulae that communicate *abstract results* of experience.

The meaning of linguistic stimuli is dependent largely upon the associations—conscious or unconscious—they evoke in us. If we can see that science and literature require different kinds of associations from us as readers, perhaps we can become aware of them as different language usages. When we are confronted with mathematical symbolism, for instance, we do not call to mind the experiences we had in learning to count. We do not remember the dogs or cats or trees or fingers we aded one to another so laboriously; we remember only that one (item) plus one (item) equals two (items). The experiences were not important for their own sakes, but for the resulting generalized concepts we attained by abstracting the numerical factor common to all of them.

And so it is with scientific formulation. From the biographies of scientists we may learn of the tremendous excitement that accompanies some new realization of a relationship between the elements of

their research. But these experiences of discovery are not of themselves important to science. It is the results of these experiences, results that are tested by carefully controlled experiments, that matter. It is the results, abstracted from the whole experience of inquiry, that must be communicated to others. Scientific writing, therefore, tends to be abstract, tends to communicate only those factors in various experiences that can be tested and verified by others, that can be, as T. C. Pollock says, "publicly discriminable."

But let us try to recall, for a moment, how it "felt" to learn to count. Now we are not primarily concerned with the result, *one plus one equals two*, that we achieved; we are interested much more in the personal valuations and emotions that were involved in the process of learning. We will remember data completely irrelevant to our counting purposes, and our response in recollection to these stimuli enables us to relive the whole context of an experience, enables us to feel again the varied emotions that accompanied our actions.

In such fashion the poet focusses upon, and his memory retains, not the results abstracted from his various experiences, but their constituent actions and sensations. He is above all concerned with the stimuli Pollock calls "privately discriminable" factors of experience, which cannot be verbalized as results, but must be realized in their immanence.

Of course, the juxtaposition of the scientific against the literary use of language is a rather extreme one. Our everyday speech is not so abstract as scientific writing. If we were to construct a mental continuum with literary formulations at the left and scientific statements at the right, different examples of ordinary speech would be ranged at different positions betwen the poles. It might be interesting to estimate the position (in terms of abstraction from actual experience) of one simple conversational statement. When we hear, for instance, that someone "bought a carving knife," we are not stimulated to imagine factors of buying and cutting experiences, like the milling of the crowds in the department stores, the riding of escalators, the fingernail polish on the hands of the salesgirls, or the expectant faces around the dinner table while the *pater familias* carves the roast, the aroma arising from the dinner plates handed down the table, the bouquet of the wine, or any of the other innumerable sensations comprising the particular situations in which buying or carving was done. We need only remember that in each buying situation, one exchanges currency for the item to be purchased, and that to carve meat, one needs a sharp steel blade. Most of our manipulation of verbal signs involves the memory not of the total context of the situations in which theese signs are employed, but only of those details which occur so frequently that they can be abstracted from these situations and generalized.

Such a process of communication, simple as it seems to us in our everyday handling of speech, is an example of a highly sophisticated use of language. In many primitive languages, different kinds of cutting can be expressed, but there is no generalized term for *cut*. One could conceivably trade-one-particular-item-for-another-particular-item, but to talk of trading (buying) in general requires too much sophistication in semantic abstraction for primitive man.

The modern tendency toward an abstract, generalized use of language is so taken for granted in everyday speaking that we can hear the words *democracy, bureaucracy, patriotism, capitalism*, with

no feeling of straining for their "meanings." Perhaps, as semanticists point out, our too-casual use of these high levels of abstraction is responsible for much of the low level of our thinking and social action. Nevertheless, since ours is a complex world, we need directions for our living in the form of communication of *results* of experiences. We need generalized terminology and concepts. Although we sometimes demand "concrete illustrations" for an abstract statement, we could hardly build systems of thought if we could think only in terms of individual situations.

II

But in our need for and our acceptance of an abstract language usage, we must not forget that our intellectualized concepts are a development constituting only one fact of linguistic behavior. Literature is not a part of this development. Though it may use the same generalized words, it uses them in such a closely hedged context as almost to negate their abstract potential. Functionally, literature can better be compared to primitive language behavior than to generalized expression of thought. I should like to suggest here the basis for such a comparison, and certain implications of such a comparison for the oral interpretation of literature.

Actually, very little is known about primitive languages: the difficulties involved in learning them are surmountable only by those patient people who decide to go into primitive cultures and really live in them. But what we know of the difficulties can provide the basis for two generalizations about primitive linguistic behavior, which can be used in our comparison between it and the literary usage of language.

One of the difficulties in understanding primitive speech, as Bronislaw Malinowski points out, is that it is so highly situational. As he says, an utterance can only be understood in its own "context of situation," never as an abstract statement, because "without an imperative stimulus of the moment, there can be no spoken statement." Words consist of cues for action in a concerted activity, or of short expressions of emotion over the progress of the venture the natives have undertaken. The student of primitive language must be on hand, observing the situation in which it is used, *participating in its action*. For a word means to a native the *handling* of the thing for which it stands. A word signifying a utensil, for instance, is not used to point to it in a general fashion as in a comment upon its appearance or its physical properties or its general uses. The word is used to indicate what shall be done with the tool at that particular time. Therefore, the word used for *boomerang*, for example, would vary in accordance with the idea of making it, reaching for it, stealing it, killing with it, or whatever else one does to or with boomerangs.

The words used are highly descriptive of physiological movements and spatial relationships, and can only be understood by responding with the movements with which they are inseparably united. The man who understands a primitive language, says Levy-Bruhl, must have at his disposal a great number of fully formed visual motor associations so that the words when spoken can set these associations going. In our language, we expect verbs to evoke particular motor associations but even our most generalized terms have primitive equivalents only in motor words. To illustrate: our demonstrative adjective *this*, although we can bound it and enclose it in a particular verbal context to direct our adjustments in terms of spatial relationships, is in itself a very general

term. Primitive language has no such general description of *this*ness. As Levy-Bruhl reports of the Klamath language of North America, there is a word denoting: a *this* (so near as to be touched); a *this* (being immediately before you); a *this* (visible, within sight); and so on. All the kinds of *this,* demand for their comprehension, a reinstatement, at least in incipient form, of motor action on the part of the observer.

But I can only suggest the primitive dependence for word meaning upon actual motor participation in a particular "context of situation." I have neither the time nor the first-hand information to do more.[1]

III

But even so short an introduction should make it obvious that to regard language as the "expression of *thought* by means of speech sounds" is to take a rather one-sided view of linguistic activity. Language is used by primitive people as *a mode of action in a particular situation* in which they happen to be engrossed. And so it is also used by the writers of literature.

We all have friends who have tried to tell us of an experience they had, who have tried to convey to us the emotions they felt. We know, therefore, from personal experience that when a situation is talked about in terms descriptive of *results,* that is, of the emotions felt by the participants as being thrilling or terrifying or joyous—we are not filled with a sense of anything except boredom. In order to share another's experience, we have to recreate it for ourselves, become involved in it ourselves; imaginally we have to meet the obstacles he did; we have to reinstate in ourselves his needs, his goals, and his actions to attain them. We have to experience his frustrations and successes before we can share his emotion.

William James had a good explanation for this fact of experience which most of us have discovered by storytelling happenchance: a particular emotion, he said, arises from particular action. If we want to be more "twentieth-century" and avoid any suggestion of a dichotomy between emotion and action, we can say with John Dewey that emotion is the *felt quality of* our *adjustments* to our environment. Thus literature, in order to accomplish its purpose of what T. S. Eliot calls an "objective correlative" of emotion, must be *a series of cues to action* whose quality will be the emotion the author wants to evoke in his readers.

In his writing, the author sets up situations which he himself must enter; he sets up characters whose motivations and adjustments he can symbolize only as he himself realizes them. Through the mechanism we know as the conditioned response, words once strongly associated with an action can later be the symbol of that action, can evoke it in incipient if not overt form. The author's words can evoke such action—if his realization is true to universal experience—not only on his part, but on the part of his readers. We can all associate with his verbal symbols, physiological memories of adjustments we have made to life situations, and so can participate in the action of the imaginal situation.

Our job as interpretive readers is to translate the symbols we find in print into the vocal and gestural symbols of the adjustments first realized by the author. It is our business, therefore, to become conscious of the adjustments we and others make to our experiences, that we may the more easily reinstate them in

[1] Excellent sources of information on the subject are: Franz Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man;* Lucien Levy-Bruhl, *How Natives Think;* Branislaw Malinowski, *The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Language;* W. I. Thomas, *Primitive Behavior.*

incipient form. Thus our audiences, responding empathically with like tensions and tentative movements, will the more readily participate in the action of the situation, will the more readily feel the emotions we and the author are attempting to evoke.

Only by entering bodily into the context of the imaginal situation, by looking upon our reading as a mode of behavior within that context, can we grasp for ourselves and convey to others, the "meaning" of a selection.

For the meaning of literature, like the meaning of primitive language signs, can be had only through participation, not through paraphrasing—as can the meaning of a more intellectualized expression of thought. The processes involved in an experience are not equatable with propositions that deal with the results of experience in abstract terms. As Bertram Morris says, "The difference is between data which mean, and processes meaningfully lived through." Science is translatable in abstract terms; poetry is not. The meaning of an experience is carried in its own particular symbolism, can only be evoked by the symbolism the experience has itself engendered. "Art," as Archibald MacLeish has said, "is an organization of experience comprehensible not in terms of something else, but of itself." We cannot equate a process with a précis.

Nor will we correct our distortion of the situation by saying that our précis is a statement of only the *logic* of the lines, that now we will proceed to analyze the emotional elements of the selection. The logic of an art experience is not the logic of the relationship either of classes or of peculiar things. A process is neither a class of things, nor a particular thing. A process—it is redundant to point out—just never *is;* it is always becoming. And the logic of art is not the logic of the operationalist any more than it is the logic of Aristotle. We can evolve logical principles to state that two atoms of hydrogen can be combined with one atom of oxygen under certain conditions to form the compound water. But we cannot evolve a proposition that can describe the behavior of any two men and any one woman with respect to any event in their experience with each other. The logic of an experience is only the psycho-logic of its own action —the inevitability of the adaptive responses made to a particular situation by particular people with their own particular predispositions and habit patterns. Any one person's response is made in a particular way because the situation is interpreted in the light of his predisposition. The response of one person dictates in part the responses of the others, which dictate in part what next adjustments shall be made—and so it continues until the experience has run its course. We have to go through one action to understand the inevitability of the next—to make it psychologically logical. The logic of an art experience is the logic of its action.

And the emotion resulting from an art experience is the quality of its action. It cannot be found by looking for a possible "emotional element" in this image or in that sound series. We have to feel organically the adjustments suggested by the symbolism in order to feel their quality as emotion.

We cannot feel, and portray, an emotion *per se*. There is no general emotion, as for instance, *fear* or *joy*, as these abstract, conceptualized words would indicate. There are only *particular fears* as the particular-fear-of-an-oncoming-train, or the particular-fear-of-a-particular-political-defeat; there are only *particular joys*, as the particular-joy-of-reunion-with-a-particular-longlost-friend.

the particular-joy-of-attaining-a-particular-long-sought-after-goal. There are only particular emotions born of particular adaptive (or non-adaptive) adjustments to stimuli. If we are to feel and to evoke certain emotions, we must make certain adjustments. There is no shortcut.

Perhaps we are laboring an already obvious point. None of us would thinkingly attempt to portray an emotion without an adequate cause. Yet that is what we sometimes actually do when we stand in front of an audience and worry about our pitch patterns, vocal quality, rate, and rhythm. And that is what we may unwittingly lead our students to do by a critical emphasis on vocal results, instead of working with them to use and increase their potentials for adjustment to the imaginal situation —adjustment which, given a well-developed voice (a basic requirement in any method of interpretation) will produce the results we want.

IV

One of the troubles with a paper like this is that after climbing up the abstraction ladder in order to get a birdseye theoretical view of literature and its relationship to other uses of language, we do not have enough time to get down to the ground floor to observe and discuss much of the detail work. There are many problems to be considered before we can gain a real comprehension of this business of imaginal participation —problems involved in becoming aware of our adaptive responses to stimuli in real life and in symbolism, problems of arousing physiological memories of these responses to make our reading more meaningful, problems of maintaining objectivity, or psychic distance, in our recall and use of these associations, to keep our reading from being idiosyncratic revisions of the author's intent, and many others. I hope we can have some of these discussed in the JOURNAL soon. But I should like to have them discussed on the premise I have tried to advance: that literature is essentially a primitive usage of language, a mode of behavior in a particular situation, not an intellectualized verbal abstraction from experience. Literature cannot be paraphrased and be so "understood." Literature must be lived.

REGIONAL DRAMA IN ONE WORLD

JONATHAN W. CURVIN*

IN today's morning paper the regional playwright finds news that must eventually bear directly upon his craft. This news is printed not in theatrical columns, but under front page headlines. Here is the story of the century: the United States has cast the die in the great international gamble. The new brave hope of a United Nations may be a portent or a great challenge for all the creative arts, not in the least excepting the drama we think of as dedicated to regional interpretation.

The stronghold of American regional drama has for many years been the university. Here playwriting, long admitted to the liberal arts curriculum, has become in some cases a group activity or project, sprung from the regional idea. We are no longer surprised, therefore, when a university attempts to bestir its students, and through its extension channels the potential playwrights outside its walls, to write drama that reflects their own environments. In fact, it is now possible to anticipate the particular arguments that will be advanced to support regional drama projects anywhere; and behind the arguments the serious intentions, the high hopes.

I

The playwright will have an opportunity, so runs the typical prospectus, to write of what he best knows and best loves, his native region. In this region he will find rich materials for his art: a mine of folklore and traditional story; fresh and original characters, far removed from the stock puppetry of the commercial theatre; and themes that will show audiences the grandeur of the American scene, and incite them to prideful awareness of their heritage. Ultimately, it is said, a true national theatre will emerge from the works of regional writers. American drama will break from the shackles that have bound it to a few side streets off Broadway in a New York only geographically American. Thus, with buoyant confidence and under the most sympathetic auspices, do regional drama projects get underway. Almost automatically the playwright has something to write about. He has a reason for writing. He attaches himself to a concrete purpose, and works, not in a vacuum, but with the bright anticipation that he will find himself as a playwright, and at the same time will discover new horizons for our national theatre.

It will be seen presently how closely all this parallels the credo for an enlightened regionalism in general. At least a few plays of first rank have been written under the regional banner. That there have not been more is due simply to the inalterable truism that exceptional talent does not grow on every bush. On the other hand, sponsored regional drama has certainly done much toward exciting several lesser talents, to the not inconsiderable pleasure of local audiences gathered in the name of community recreation. And we need not apologize for dilettantism as a by-product of the movement, so long as the by-product is not confused with the larger intent. Once we have conceded this, however, we are still justified in asking: "Has regional drama kept its most difficult promises?"

II

Nearly ten years ago Howard W. Odum and Harry E. Moore published

*Project Associate, Wisconsin Idea Theatre, University of Wisconsin.

their definitive *American Regionalism.* In a chapter devoted to literary and aesthetic regionalism[1] they quoted generously from various critics who either would proscribe regionalism altogether, or who would admit of its significance only if it lived up to certain high (and sometimes vague) standards. Odum and Moore, who readily granted the existence in America of a vigorous and potentially important regional literature, showed in their critical synthesis concern for its immediate future. According to them the enemy to a "genuine" regionalism was the fetish of localism.

Genuine regionalism in literature, they concluded, does not exploit quaintness. It is not sentimentally bound to the past, seeking refuge in the past as in a kind of shelter against the storms and strife of the present. Nor is it content with the exclusive use of rural themes. It is, finally, unwilling to be judged by mediocre aesthetic standards. These are the sins of localism. True regionalism aims at bigger game and a wider range. Allowing for and even stressing the relationships between character and milieu, whether of social structure or the "physical and cultural landscape," the enlightened writer will curb his taste for antiquarianism, and will concentrate on presenting "the human spirit in every aspect in correlation with its immediate environment."

Clearly the distinction between localism and regionalism is not one of proportion, but of focus. Regionalism becomes localism when it substitutes incidental values for the universality implicit in attention to "the human spirit." Thus what might be called emancipated regionalism belongs in our cultural mainstream or, more accurately, in a vital tributary, upon which the mainstream depends for its very existence. This, at any rate, was the general assumption less than a decade ago.

Today in a changed world, when one has the disconcerting impression that so many of the old criteria won't quite do, we are inclined to wonder whether even the most plausible defence of regionalism will quite do either. Once localism was the threat; today the rising tide of internationalism has taken its place. The regionalist may come to a time when he no longer can say, "My story is but a chapter in the nation's story." That may not be enough when nationalism is not enough.

The British historian, Arnold Toynbee, has recently thrown down the gage to his colleagues. Speaking at Princeton's Bicentennial, he declared: "We must make the necessary effort of imagination and effort of will to break our way out of the prison walls of the local and short-lived histories of our own countries and our own cultures."[2] And Mr. Graham Hutton, after a searching appraisal of our Midwestern culture, has predicted the demise of regional thinking under the impact of current history and the inevitable standardizations of our day.[3] Hutton sees the "locality" in the process of "being extended to take in vast regions of the earth's surface and many nations," so that "ever quickening communications result in ever quickening reactions: roughly the same kind of reactions everywhere at roughly the same moment." Hutton calls the attempt to nourish the creative intelligence and to sponsor cultural life in self-conscious regions a protective enterprise, doomed to frustration, not alone because it is an attempt to buck a contemporary trend, but also because the creative intelligence will bloom or not, irrespective of locale.

[1] (1938), pp. 168-188.

[2] Quoted in *Time*, XLIX (1947), 76.

[3] *Midwest at Noon* (Chicago, 1946), pp. 322-323.

III

Such words as these purport to compose the handwriting on the wall. Surely no regional writer can afford to ignore their possible implications for him. Nor can he ignore the evidence from his own street that a strong regional faith has somehow not emerged, as many thought it would, out of the faith-shattering experiences of war.

During the war years thousands of us, involuntarily residents of North Africa, Italy, the Philippines, Australia or Japan, and drearily homesick for the American scene, grew to have a new view of our native regions. We didn't even stop with regions. We argued loudly, vociferously, in defense of our particular counties, towns, cities, even specific blocks or streets. Each to his own was true. "Brother, if I ever get back to that little ol' white house of mine in Appleton, Wisconsin, I won't ever leave, not even to go to Milwaukee." We freshly evaluated our own circumscribed locales, and found them good. Returned from enforced worldliness, we declared ourselves forevermore regionalistic in the most aggressive and narrowest sense. Give us art, we said, in harmony with our mood: paintings of our beloved local scene; songs of our own people; and plays about both. Or let us create such art ourselves. We came back more than genially receptive to the regional idea.

Gradually we are coming to realize how homesick we must have been, as we measure the dream by the reality, and as we see our sentimental conception of the old hometown pale before some stern truths and some inevitable facts. I am not referring here to current disillusionments (true though it is that no part of America is irresistible if you can't find a place to live there), but rather to the pressure of contemporary events out there beyond the cherished regional boundaries.

IV

Now if what has been said rightly suggests that regionalism may soon be obliged to defend its tenets or expire, then what defense can we expect from him who in the past has been one of its most articulate champions, the playwright?

William Peery, who for many years was an active member of the University of North Carolina's Playmakers, has predicted that the Playmakers, like Ireland's Abbey Players before them, would fail unless they saw fit to correct some glaring flaws in their folk-playwriting.[4] Peery contends that in the first place the Carolina writers have been too much interested in the past, which they considered not as history, but as "a living anachronism." Playwrights, in order to satisfy audiences of today, must "treat problems typical of today or lose that creative power derived from native materials which largely accounts for the success of folk movements in the past." Peery has decried, too, the absorption in "folk trappings," quaint speech and manners, and the accompanying condescending attitude of playwright toward his characters. The folk dramatist has allowed the peculiarities of his region to carry his play, expecting the uniqueness of its content to mask his own dearth of technical skill. Dramatic values reside, where they ever have, not in the trappings, but in the "human problem."

As for the professional critics, most of them have looked with skeptical eye on the professedly regional play; or perhaps, because such plays have flourished in the hinterland rather than in New York, they have simply remained unaware of

[4] William Peery, "American Folk Drama Comes of Age," *American Scholar*, XI (1942), 149-157.

the regional product until it has occasionally advanced to Broadway for a hearing. One suspects that of all the New York critics John Mason Brown has been most conscious of the cultural scene beyond Broadway. Try as he will to be sympathetic to regional drama, however, Mr. Brown admits that it has failed so far to measure up.[5] It has failed, he says, because it has been isolationist, because it has been content to satisfy local audiences with plays intelligible to these audiences alone. "Most regionalists have erred in making us feel how large a place is the world that is removed from their special scene. But all great dramatists have so included us in their plays that, while in their presence, our one conviction is that the world must be very small indeed." Brown feels that in addition to poverty of appeal and limitation of interests, too many of the regional dramatists are shy on ability. They have neglected to master the craft they practice.

So much for the critical charges against dramatic regionalism. The playwright can reply to them only through his plays themselves, which soon enough will betray the regional philosophy behind them.

V

Yet in my view it would seem absurdly autocratic to disqualify as play subject matter the store of folklore and past history available to the regionalist. What should be questioned is the attitude toward this material, or its *exclusive* use. Nostalgic looking-backward to a dead society, invidious or superficial comparisons between that society and our own, has too often stamped our regional drama, even has come to be its distinguishing feature. By all means let the artist claim his material from whatever day or age best shows forth the struggle of man. But let him realize that the urgencies of his own time must not be outlawed, nor that as a regionalist he may exercise peculiar liberties toward the historic past.

Typicality in modern drama has resulted in some hackneyed grotesques, agreed; and the regionalist in protest has advocated fidelity to character. Unfortunately he has not always met his own challenge. Surely the local eccentric who shows up in many a regional play is but a poor relation of true dramatic character. His presence may delight the few who recognize him and vouch for his actual existence outside the play's frame; but when, as so often happens, the playwright dangles him on obvious strings, then at the proper moment enlists him to fulfill a chore of plot adjustment, this "character" begins to creak in the joints. He would flunk any test of universality because his creator has neglected his obligation to show Man in his own image.

Finally, there is the matter of technique, the laborious job of mastering the craft of writing plays. The best, and the irrefutable, answer to critics of regional drama will be plays which exhibit a control over form. To scorn technical competence, while asserting that regional plays have merits enough to compensate for shabby craftsmanship, is suspicious behavior. It is one thing to experiment with new techniques, quite another to minimize technique altogether. Many of the greatest plays in dramatic literature have been essentially regional plays. They will remain great, however, not because of their regionalism, but because of the happy marriage of their content and their form.

Regional drama has already earned

[5] John Mason Brown, "Regionalism and the Theatre," *Saturday Review of Literature*, XXVIII (1945), 34-35.

its way, as well as the right to favorable prospects in the years to come. We who are solicitous for its continued healthful development see that it must be guided away from some of its self-destroying excesses. For regional drama does tend to go to extremes. In escape from mere journalism it has lurked too shyly in a romanticized past; in escape from typicality of character, it has courted eccentricity; and in escape from rigidity of conventional form it has disparaged the craftsman's tools. Once these vagaries have been remedied, regional drama should keep its noble promises. It will become art. And a valid art may be presumed always to meet the challenges of newspaper headlines.

ORIGINAL PLAYS IN THE COLLEGE THEATRE

ROGER BOYLE*

THE case for original plays in the college theatre is familiar to us all. I shall not take the time to argue it here. If we grant that the production of the playwright's untried script is a worthwhile undertaking, there remains the problem of how to make the venture a valuable and productive experience for all concerned. How should our procedures with the original play differ from procedures with the revival of an established play?

I

In the first place, we must set some reasonable minimum standard as a guide in selecting the scripts which are to receive the benefit of production. We cannot put on a play just *because* it is an "original." I firmly believe that working with a new play is as valuable an experience to the actor and the director as it is to the playwright—but only if the script presents an opportunity as well as a challenge. The play cannot be brought to life in the theatre unless it has within it the spark of life. To be worthy of production it must say something which has not been said in the same terms before; it must show a natural emotional expressiveness in the author and at least an elementary understanding of playwriting technique. A playwright who has not reached this stage of development will learn something from a production, but there are less expensive and painful ways to teach him. In fact, there is no surer way to discourage the beginner than to give him a production before he is ready for it.

On the other hand, if the novice playwright is forced to compete for a place on the program on equal terms with the professional of established reputation, it is clear that we have little or nothing to offer him. On these terms Broadway can, and does, grant him a hearing.

It is not too difficult to find scripts which are worth the attention of director, actor, and audience. Even if no course in playwriting is offered, there is on the campus an interest in creative writing which will find expression in dramatic form, if offered any encouragement. Nor is it necessary to limit the field to the local playwright. A particularly valuable source of longer plays is provided, for example, by the New Play Project of the American Educational Theatre Association.

But to return to the problems of production. In many colleges producing original plays is logically regarded as part of the experimental or laboratory work in drama and one-act scripts are frequently assigned to student directors. This is both expedient and educationally sound, but it does present something of a danger. The new play needs and deserves a good production. The combination of the untried play with an untried director and, possibly, untried actors is very experimental indeed.

If we borrow the philosophy of conscious experiment from the science people, we also should follow their procedure of reducing the variables in the situation as much as possible. It seems to me that the student director should have credit for at least one successful staging of a standard play before he attempts a one-act original. Not that directing skill can be developed with one production, but, at any rate, the student

*Assistant Professor of Speech and Drama and Director of the Virginia Players, University of Virginia.

will have behind him the mistakes everyone makes the first time, and will have a measure of self-confidence in dealing with cast and playwright. The problem of sustaining the full-length original play should properly be left to the trained and fully seasoned director. Every effort should be made to secure for the new play the most experienced actors available.

The question often arises of whether the playwright should be encouraged to direct or act a part in his own play. He knows better than anyone else what he is trying to get across; and if he has ability in these related arts, the production may gain in unity and coherence by having him serve in a dual capacity. Such combinations often are very successful in the professional theatre.

It is my experience, however, that it is wiser for the novice to restrict himself to his playwriting function. As an actor in his own play, he will not only be distracted by the additional burden, but will lose the opportunity of seeing his play as a member of the audience.

This is more than merely a matter of observing the play from an advantageous position. In spite of a playwright's (or a director's) superior knowledge of a play, it is possible for him partly to lose his own identity in the audience, and to sense directly the group response which is such a distinctive feature of the theatre experience. This sensing of audience reaction is not, of course, a mystic or telepathic transference of thought or emotion. It is the sum total of conscious and subconscious observation of audience reactions, such as changes in breathing, in tension, and in movement. Many of these changes are too minute to be observed from the stage but are discernable to the playwright who sits with the crowd.

A further point to be considered is that if a student directs his own play, he loses the opportunity for cooperative work with one who is in a position to see his play with better perspective. Also the playwright-director is usually at considerable disadvantage in dealing with the cast.

That the embryo playwright should strengthen his understanding of the theatre by practical experience in acting, directing, and the other departments of play production is obvious. But there should be plenty of opportunity for this apart from his own play.

The relationship between director and playwright is extremely important. There must be the fullest understanding and cooperation between them. Though their basic functions are different and distinct, there will be a blending of their responsibilities as the work progresses. The precise evolution of the relationship will depend on the individuals, but in the college theatre it is the duty of the teacher to see that the collaboration of student director and playwright is proceeding harmoniously and productively.

A point to watch is that the sharing of responsibility does not result in a division of leadership for the cast. It is advisable for the playwright to refrain from making suggestions directly to the cast, unless specifically requested by the director to do so.

There is a popular conception that the playwright in the professional theatre (unless he happens to be Eugene O'Neill) has his script cut and amended at will by producer, director, actors, and stage hands. Perhaps occasionally there is something in support of this, but in all cases the playwright's contract protects him from such abuse.

Surely we can do no less in the amateur theatre. If the writer cannot be easily persuaded of the need for specific

alterations, it is wiser to refer the issue to the supreme court of audience reaction. The lessons the performance can teach should not be nullified by his feeling that the script was too mutilated for a fair hearing.

This does not mean that the playwright should be spared frank criticism. The professional dramatist is subject to more criticism than any other creative writer. He gets it from his fellow workers on the production, as well as from the public and reviewers. He needs to learn how to take criticism, both constructive and otherwise, with equanimity, to evaluate it and to utilize it in the improvement of his work. However, it is important that his function as playwright is not usurped by others.

The director and the teacher of playwriting must be careful to avoid the common pitfall in the criticism of creative writing: that of intruding a personal bias. The danger is that the critic may not really be seeking to improve the work in question but unconsciously desiring to make it conform more nearly to the play he would like to write himself from the same material. A concentrated effort must be made to discover, with the writer, what he is essentially trying to express and then to help him put it across in terms of practical theatre.

The morale of the cast is an important factor in the production of the new play. The student actor is very likely to regard the original script with a certain cynicism. The playwright's personal presence is not reassuring. He exposes his human frailties like anyone else, instead of being neatly embalmed in the History of the Theatre or in Winchell's column.

The director must serve as the writer's champion. He must have faith in the script before he accepts the assignment and he must convey this faith to the cast. This involves no supersalesmanship; but it does involve the expression of his belief that the merits of the play justify its production, and it does involve the determination to present the play as effectively as possible.

The actor must find inspiration in the challenge of the untried role and in the opportunity to work directly with the author.

The playwright can well expect to improve his plays through revisions suggested by the experience of rehearsal. There is indeed theatre magic in the intelligent cooperative effort of playwright, director, and actor. However, in the college production too much should not be expected in the way of revision during the rehearsal period itself. The difficulty lies in the fact that the average amateur develops this interpretation of a part very gradually. He cannot give, after a few rehearsals, a good rendition of the part as the professional can. The need for revision of certain scenes is not unmistakably clear until very late in the rehearsal period. One clings to the hope that once the actor gets the hang of it, all will be well, and sometimes the hope is justified.

If the rehearsals are developing slowly the director and writer may find it necessary to accept the script as it is, and devote the available time to smoothing out the work of the cast. In any case, it is advisable to do everything possible to improve the script before rehearsals start and also to allow a somewhat longer rehearsal period than is usual for the producing group.

There remains the question of the reaction of the college audience to original plays. Our experience at Virginia is that we draw a slightly larger audience for a laboratory bill of original one-acts than for a bill of standard short plays. Our audiences for long originals (which

we present as major productions) are substantially smaller than for recent Broadway successes or for famous plays of the past. The same admission charge is made for original plays as for the others and no economies are attempted in production expenses. This is important, as any demonstrated lack of faith in the undertaking will weaken the efforts of the entire production staff.

To sum up: An original play should be accepted for production only if it has genuine merit. Once accepted, it should be treated with as much respect, and given as good a production, as any other play presented by the group. For best results, the writer should assist the director, but neither direct, nor act in his own play; and he should not attempt more than minor revisions of the play during the rehearsal period. He should be given frank but at all times constructive and sympathetic criticism, and he should be made confident that the director is backing him and the basic intention of his play to the full. The staging of the new play without proper regard for the special problems involved can be a waste of everyone's time, including the audience's. Properly approached, it can be a stimulating and satisfying experience for all concerned.

SERVICEABLE SPEECH IN A DEMOCRACY

WILLIAM J. TEMPLE*

IN remarking on the place of speech correction in a democratic society, my aim is (to paraphrase a sentence from the preface to John Walker's *Elocution*) not a florid harangue on the advantages of good speaking, but some plain thoughts that may convey real and useful instruction.

I

Education for democracy is ideally education of all the citizens for personal liberty and social responsibility. There is general agreement that an educated man or woman should be able to express himself well and rationally in order to protect and enjoy his personal liberty and to exercise his responsibility as a member of the group in which he lives.

It is no accident that the ability to speak one's own language correctly and effectively stands high on every list of the characteristics which are desirable in a useful member of a democratic society. In the kind of society in which we live, where everybody shares the responsibility for the common good, not only does a person's own achievement depend principally on his own ability rather than on his birth into a ruling class, but the good of the group as a whole depends on getting the best service for the group from the persons who have the most ability.

A person who cannot speak effectively is limited in the extent to which he can work cooperatively with others in common enterprises and in the extent to which he can contribute to the common good of his groups. A person whose speech is incorrect to the point of being defective may not only be unable to contribute to the good of his groups, but may even be a burden to his group if his defect is so severe that he cannot support himself.

The task of speech education in general is the cultivation of an ability which in its highest development is associated with the greatest of human achievements. The task of speech correction is the humbler work of training individuals whose speech is defective. A society which neglects speech education and speech correction not only deprives itself of the best services of some of its citizens, but also burdens itself with the care of some who might with training become self-supporting or even contributing members of the group.

II

If the ability to speak correctly and effectively deserves its high place among the goals of liberal education, why then do not speech education and speech correction stand equally high in school budgets? Is it because most people learn to speak correctly and effectively without special training? Is it because of disagreement as to what constitutes correct and effective speaking; or distrust of the standards of the speech correctionists? Is it because of disbelief in the efficacy of the methods of speech correction; or misunderstanding of the aims of speech correction?

It is undoubtedly true that many people do learn to speak correctly without special instruction. But surveys show that a significant percentage of school children have speech that is not only incorrect but defective. Children whose speech is so defective that they cannot

*Associate Professor of Speech and Counsellor in the Veterans Counseling Office, Brooklyn College.

attend school are not counted in these surveys. And when we consider effective speaking, the success of Dale Carnegie and others indicates that there are a great many adults who feel that they themselves need more training than they got in school and college.

The speech correctionist does not hold forth the hope to his spastic, stuttering, aphasic, deaf, or organically handicapped patients that they may some day if they follow his guidance and practise faithfully become Roosevelts or Barrymores or radio announcers or glamorous figures in a world where talented speakers win fame and fortune. The goal set before these genuinely crippled speakers is not the inspiring oratory of great humanitarian leaders, or the beautiful speech of great actors, or the merely faultless speech of those who read commercial advertisements into microphones, but the serviceable speech by which people live and work with each other. To be serviceable, speech must be at least audible and intelligible, and for many speech defectives the acquisition of audibility and intelligibility is a sufficiently difficult task to challenge their best efforts.

But the speech correctionist has to deal not only with the aphasic, the paralyzed, the deaf, the stuttering, and the organically defective speakers, but also with those whose speech is incorrect or defective because they have learned from poor models, or have fallen into bad habits, or otherwise developed sound substitutions or distortions, or "dialect" speech, or voices that are something less than "beautiful." These constitute the great majority of those who come or are sent to speech clinics and speech correctionists for help and training.

These articulatory cases and voice cases furnish most of the work of the school clinics, and it is in dealing with these cases that some of the most confusing and exasperating and difficult problems arise to plague the clinician and his colleagues. They are the problems which arise out of the difficulty of defining and distinguishing between the "normal" and the "abnormal," and of agreeing on the adequacy and suitability of speech patterns to the social or educational or vocational status of the speaker.

III

For speakers of these types as well as for the genuinely crippled speakers, the sensible and democratic goal is serviceable, rather than "beautiful" or "perfect," speech.

In the first place, people's ideals of beautiful or perfect speech are far from uniform or consistent. No model is universally acceptable. No speaker is beyond criticism. The Yankee dialect in the South, traces of Yiddish or other foreign accent in a Middle-western town, or colonial speech in the capital of an empire furnish targets for prejudice and intolerance. Franklin Roosevelt's fireside chats were followed by indignant letters to the editors of the daily papers complaining of his pronunciations or his choice of words, and cheap wits from coast to coast burlesqued the intonation of his opening phrase of salutation.

Actually, of course, the regional or personal elements in a person's speech patterns have nothing to do with his personal worth or the value or importance of what he says. The fault lies with the listener whose ignorance and prejudice are unmasked by them. The speech correctionist can do a great deal for the pupils who come to him for help in eliminating foreign or regional dialect, or for correction of lisps or baby-talk, or for strengthening and clarifying weak, badly pitched, or unpleasant voices, and in that way prepare them to avoid this type of criticism. But the correctionist

should never say even by implication that sound distortion or substitution or dialect or lack of a beautiful voice bars a person from worthwhile achievement or citizenship.

In the second place, the school correctionist is not a Professor Higgins coaching lowly flower sellers to masquerade in high society. He does not earn his salary by playing fairy godmother to Cinderellas. He does not hold up social shibboleths as standards of speaking. He does not appeal to motives of class distinction and snobbishness. He believes, with H. W. Fowler, that "the ambition to do better than our neighbors is in many departments of life a virtue; in pronunciation it is a vice."

When I was a boy in a small town in western Pennsylvania, my classmates and I were disturbed to hear from a teacher that for educated people the only correct pronunciation of *banana* is [bənɑ:nə]. Her statement was so obviously contrary to verifiable fact as to raise in our minds grave doubts of her competence. We lived in a college town where we could easily observe the pronunciation of presumably educated people, and our impression was that they said [bənænə]. Rather than conclude that we were unfortunately being brought up in a community where even the best people spoke a corrupted and vulgar form of English, we ascribed our teacher's apparent willful deafness to reality to the well-known indifference of school teachers to the really important and enjoyable facts of life.

School children and teachers of today have access not only to the speech of their own and their neighbors' homes, and local platforms and pulpits for models of current English speech, but also, by way of their radio receivers, to the speech of people of other communities and people of respectable, admirable, and even inspiring achievement in many kinds of human affairs. There is less excuse than ever before for narrowness, provincialism, and intolerance in standards of correctness in speaking, and there is abundant opportunity to observe the serviceability of speech in democratic processes even when its patterns are different from our own.

Does anyone think less of Cordell Hull's service to his country because of his inability to pronounce *l*'s and *r*'s? Is Winston Churchill a less powerful orator and leader because he lisps? Were Theodore Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie less influential in public affairs because of their voices? Is Commander John Bulkeley less deserving of the Congressional Medal of Honor or is he a less capable officer because he can not produce a normal *l*? Is Bennet Cerf less successful as a publisher or story-teller because his *r* sounds like a *w*? Are the comments of Raymond Swing or Elmer Davis or Fiorello LaGuardia less cogent or less stimulating because their voices are not as beautiful as the voice of Maurice Evans? Were William Knudsen's services in our industrial mobilization less effective or less valuable because he speaks English with a foreign accent?

Naturally, speech teachers and correctionists, like other people, will always have personal preferences in matters of speech and voice as they do in other personal matters, like dress, which are subject to individual variation and taste as well as to social scrutiny and the pressures of group custom and style. But their professional standards are, or ought to be, another matter. If the speech correctionist cannot distinguish between his personal and his professional standards, his lessons in "How to Speak Correctly" ought rather to be called "How to Be More Like Me."

A third good reason for adopting the goal of serviceable rather than "perfect" or "beautiful" speech is the educational doctrine of the attainable goal. More harm than good is done to the pupil, the teacher, and the profession by constant exhortation to unrealistic, impossibly high ideals. It is no disparagement of Helen Keller's magnificent achievement in acquiring speech to admit that her speech is still conspicously different from normal speech. It is cruel and false to suggest to a student with defective speech that anything short of "perfection" is failure. The inevitable result is not achievement but frustration.

Frustration is bad for the correctionist, too, because it leads to old-maidism regardless of the age, sex, or marital status of the sufferer. The resulting neurosis is known and recognized as an occupational disorder of the medical and other professions where there is always a gap between professional ideals and practical possibilities. The best remedy is prevention by becoming aware of the rewards and satisfactions of reasonable achievement.

Unrealistic aims are bad for the profession because they lead outsiders to the conclusion that speech training is an educational frill giving employment to silly people who try to teach children to put on airs.

Speech correction in a democratic society serves democracy by training handicapped people to become self-respecting, contributing citizens, by practising and teaching tolerance for individuals and groups of people who are not quite like ourselves, and by working toward realistic goals for defective speakers. It deserves support commensurate with the high importance of correct and effective speaking in education for personal freedom and social responsibility. A democratic society needs speech correction.

WHY THE INDIAN DOES NOT STUTTER

JOHN C. SNIDECOR*

THE incidence of stuttering in American Indian tribes is negligible to the point where such speech deviations create no problems on the part of the home or school.[1]

The writer interviewed over 800 Indians and failed to find one pure-blooded Indian who stuttered. Indirectly data were obtained relative to 1000 more Indians with the result that two half-breed Indians were discovered who might reasonably be diagnosed as stutterers. One full-blooded Indian woman was reported as a stutterer, and it was said of her that "she stuttered when sober, not when drunk." This woman was singularly peripatetic in her habits, and died, presumably of chronic alchoholism, before I could catch up with her. The reports on this woman's speech were insufficiently complete to warrant a diagnosis of stuttering.

Granting that an occasional Indian may stutter, the incidence is low. From 18 to 40 stutterers would have been discovered in a normal white population the size of that surveyed in this study. Once one becomes acquainted with the Indian there is an ample flow of speech, either in Indian or English, to allow for reasonable classification of speech defects.

The question immediately arises, "Why does the Indian fail to stutter?" Etiological factors in stuttering are probably so diverse, and opinion changes so rapidly that it would appear that we should always refer to the "causes of stuttering," both as regards stutterers as a group, and the stutterer as an individual. For this reason some of the frequently-stated causes of stuttering are reviewed in relationship to those causal factors that exist only in small part in the culture of the American Indian.

(1) If change of native handedness is a cause of stuttering, then we would expect the Indians in the group studied to be free or relatively free from stuttering. That parents did not interfere with handedness is evidenced by the fact that no parent interviewed had ever thought of handedness as a problem. Only one Indian, and he was a half-breed, was noted to have had his handedness changed, and this man had changed from his left to his right hand because the left arm was broken and incapacitated over an extended period of time. It is of interest that this half-breed stuttered. However, it must be noted that the state of mixed blood in the Indian group poses certain problems of social adjustment which might indicate that the factors in this case are more psychogenic than neurological. Unfortunately it was impossible to discover whether the stuttering in this case developed directly after the shift in handedness, or not. One Indian observer said that the stuttering and shift occurred at the same time, but this observer had promised to help the interpreter find a stutterer and was so elated at his find that his judgment may have been clouded by the very apparent excitement he felt at "striking pay dirt." So far as could be discovered, the teachers in this area had made no attempt to change the handedness of their

*Associate Professor of Speech and Head of the Department of Speech, University of California, Santa Barbara College.

The observations upon which this article is based were made during a two-year period of study of the speech of the Bannock and Shoshone tribes of Southeastern Idaho, 1937-1939.

[1] Johnson, Wendell, *People in Quandaries* (1946), pp. 441-443; "The Search for a Stuttering Indian."

pupils; thus interference with handedness in school appears to be ruled out.

(2) If birth injuries are a cause of stuttering, the Indian has at least a slight advantage over the white in two directions. Even though statements concerning ease of birth with the Indian mother are probably exaggerated, the fact remains that she is usually incapacitated at delivery for a relatively short period of time. It is reasonable to assume that birth is likewise easier on the child. Second, Indian children injured at birth have fewer chances of surviving than do white children. The Indian mother is seldom in the hands of a physician, and a specialist is seldom or ever available in case of special emergencies. (As an aside, the writer did not observe any cerebral palsied children among the Indians surveyed, although cerebral palsied Indians have been observed by physicians in the Indian Service.) It should be stated that the Indian appears to have little desire for the survival of an unfit child. It is difficult to generalize regarding hygienic conditions in the Indian group, but superficially at least life appears to be more rugged, and chances for the survival of the defective Indian child appear to be fewer than for the defective white child.

(3) If emotional difficulties inherent in the speaking situation are a cause of stuttering, the Indian has fewer reasons for stuttering than has the white man. During infancy the Indian father and mother exert very little pressure upon the child to speak. The ability to speak appears to be evaluated as a normal developmental process not to be quickened by overanxious parents for purposes of display. Adult Indians in their own culture do not speak under pressure unless they so choose. The adult Indian faced with a critical question does not feel obligated to hurry his answer. He will frequently sit and cogitate upon the problem until he is completely ready to answer, and then his reply may be spoken with little if any substantiation for his opinion. It is possible for a highly respected Indian to sit upon a tribal council and answer simply "yes" or "no" to questions of importance to the tribe. The Indian's success as a farmer and a hunter is sufficient to contribute ethical proof to statements of simple affirmation and negation. Many Indians are able to speak and answer with signs instead of spoken language. The fact of the matter is that he seldom chooses to answer in this manner, but the way is always open for those who know the sign language. When the Indian is a public speaker he is one by choice. Adequate social adjustment depends far less upon the ability to speak than in our society. On the other hand, there are outstanding public speakers in the Bannock and Shoshone tribes, but these men simply use and display a communicative skill which appears as a desirable, but relatively unessential, contribution to success and esteem.

(4) If the factor of labelling the act of stuttering is important, Indians, at least those of the Bannock and Shoshone tribes, are never under this semantic disadvantage. Johnson[2] has developed this point fully; and there certainly is no specific word for stuttering in the language of either of the above mentioned tribes. However, the word kɛɪdɛgət means "can't talk," and the word kɛɪdʒandɛɪqwənt means "he can't talk well." The prefix kɛɪ is the common negative prefix as found in the above words and in kɛɪdɛɪnungət which means "can't hear well."

(5) It would be easy to suggest that Indians don't stutter because there are

[2] Johnson, W., "The Indians Have No Word for It," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXX (October, 1944), 330-337.

in general fewer neurotics than in the white group. The writer does not care to propose that more or fewer Indians are neurotic or psychotic when compared to whites. From Rousseau to the present there has been a cult of the "noble savage" who lived the simple life without shame or guilt for his shortcomings, or those of others. If the Indian is a noble savage, he must be one primarily in the minds of those like Rousseau who have not observed the Indian closely and critically in his own culture. The fact of the matter is that the Indian commits murder, quarrels with other males, beats his wife, and gets roaring drunk just about as frequently as his white counterpart. In turn, he runs afoul of the law, is censored by other members of the tribe, suffers from a "hangover" just as his white brother does. In brief, the reservation Indian appears to experience just about the same degree of tensions as the white. Considering the somewhat inferior position of the Indian, it is surprising that he is not more neurotic than he is. On the other hand, his inferior position is somewhat balanced by the security given him by a paternal government. Inferiority may well be balanced by security. Statistical or observational data is simply not available, but I believe that the Indian is probably no more likely to be a "neurotic personality" than the white.

The survey under discussion substantiates the commonly held opinion that few, if any, pure-blooded American Indians stutter. In the opinion of the writer the reasons for this freedom from stuttering may be stated briefly as follows:

(1) There is little effort to change native handedness in the group studied; (2) low incidence of birth injuries, and lack of survival of the birth injured favor the Indian group; (3) emotional difficulties inherent in the act of speaking in our society do not appear to be present in the society of the Indians studied; (4) the Indian does not have a word for stuttering, and therefore is unlikely to be labelled as a stutterer; and (5) although I do not have evidence upon which to base a definite opinion as to how far and in what ways the Indian is neurotic, it is my impression that the Indian is probably akin to the white in respect to neurotic tendencies.

BUT *IS* IT APHASIA?

JEANETTE ANDERSON*

WHEN is an individual aphasic? Evidently, for a good many practicing speech correctionists and other specialists in allied fields, an aphasia is present when the observed atypical linguistic behavior of a patient fits conveniently into no other diagnostic pigeonhole. Aphasia, apparently, has become a kind of waste-basket diagnostic designation for severe disturbances of speech that cannot be more accurately diagnosed. Just as a few years ago many obscure pathological entities encountered in medical practice were classified as allergies or hypersensitive conditions for want of more specific differential diagnoses, so there seems now to be a tendency among speech therapists to regard as aphasic any atypical speech symptoms that do not manifest themselves clearly as articulatory, phonatory, hard-of-hearing, or stuttering in nature. Aphasia is not always differentiated from mental retardation, dysarthria, hearing disability, aphonia, and neurotic or psychotic conditions which may produce linguistic disturbances similar to those associated with aphasic states.

A vague but increasing awareness of this trend in the direction of making the term "aphasia" a diagnostic catch-all was brought sharply and abruptly into focus during the past several months. Out of a group of ten patients recently referred to a college speech clinic as aphasics after examination and diagnosis by one or more speech correctionists, only two were found upon prolonged and intensive investigation to be aphasic; the remaining eight emerged as cases of significantly retarded mentation, dysarthria so marked that it was almost anarthria, or combinations of these two conditions; defective hearing and possible psychological maladjustment were present in some cases as secondary factors acting to produce faulty speech.

It would appear that there is real need to review and perhaps to restate the criteria by which the diagnosis of aphasia is made. That there should be a need for this recapitulation is not astonishing. Fewer than 0.3 per cent of all cases of defective speech are aphasic in nature.[1] This means that only three out of a thousand speech defectives are aphasics and, moreover, that only three out of 10,000 to 20,000 individuals in the general population are aphasic enough to be so diagnosed. There are, fortunately, few aphasics; so few, apparently, that a goodly number of speech correctionists escape from college and university classes and clinics without ever encountering one and, as a result, they quite literally do not know an aphasic when they see one. This observation was confirmed in conference the other day when a speech correctionist in a supervisory position for a state division of services for handicapped children remarked that during five years as an undergraduate and graduate student in speech correction at a large university she had not seen one aphasic patient. These speech correctionists must rely upon textbook descriptions to aid them in diagnosing aphasia. In a recently published observation concerning aphasic patients, Eisenson comments: "Aphasic patients and especially young aphasics, whose

*Associate Professor of Speech and Director of the Speech Clinic, Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois.

[1] Robert West, Lou Kennedy, Anna Carr, *The Rehabilitation of Speech* (1937), p. xix.

disturbances are related to traumatic head injuries, are an inconsistent and unconventional lot, who show little evidence of what the textbooks indicate their behavior ought to be as a result of their injuries."[2]

At least three factors should be taken into account before a diagnosis of aphasia is made. First, the examiner ought to ascertain whether the observed condition squares with any accepted definition of the aphasic condition. Next, all linguistic manifestations should be noted and described as accurately as possible to determine whether they correspond with manifestations generally agreed to be aphasic. Finally, the presence of the aphasic state and its manifestations should be established by a series of diagnostic measures designed to differentiate it from other conditions for which it is commonly mistaken.[3] Nance's suggestions for differential diagnosis appear helpful except that it would seem difficult to rule out birth injury as a discrete entity apart from aphasia when birth injury is not infrequently regarded as a possible etiologic factor in aphasia.

I

From the point of view of speech pathology, aphasia includes all linguistic disturbances, expressive or receptive, caused by a lesion of the brain but not attributable to faulty innervation of the musculature used in speech or writing, nor to pathology of the sense organs themselves, nor to general mental deficiency; these language disturbances are to be understood as failures in symbolization, retention and production of mental concepts in association with conventional phonetic and chirographic symbols. Aphasia is not to be confused with inability to speak because of auditory failure, paralyzed musculature, or general mental deficiency. Aphasia is a specialized linguistic loss and is a disturbance of association. The aphasic individual has an adequate mechanism for producing speech, and the mechanism is in working order; the difficulty seems to be that he no longer knows how to make it work. "L'aphasique ne sait plus parler; l'anarthrique ne peut plus parler."[4]

Aphasias, then, are manifested by disturbances of the reception, retention or expression of linguistic symbols in the absence of inability to understand or produce written or spoken language because of general mental retardation, failure of the muscles of articulation, phonation or writing, defective hearing, or any other physical condition acting to prevent any other aspect of the speech act than association or symbolization. The patient "can still move all the muscles for chewing, clearing his throat, expectorating, etc.: it is only movements to make sounds constituting symbols of speech that he has forgotten. . . . Dysarthria and anarthria are in no sense aphasia."[5]

In descriptive summary, then, a patient who is intelligent in behavior that does not require language, who hears, who can phonate and articulate and still has trouble understanding, interpreting, or producing written or spoken language is likely to be aphasic. The aphasic state may exist on either an organic or functional basis or on a combination of the two. When the basis is functional, the brain lesion may be a psychological one.

[2] Jon Eisenson, "Aphasics: Observations and Tentative Conclusions," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (1947), 290.

[3] L. S. Nance, "Differential Diagnosis of Aphasia in Children," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XI (1946), 219-223.

[4] Robert Bing, *Compendium of Regional Diagnosis in Lesions of the Brain and Spinal Cord*, translated and edited by Webb Haymaker (St. Louis, 1940), 241.

[5] J. M. Nielsen, *Agnosia, Apraxia, Aphasia* (Los Angeles, 1936), 35, 183.

Two cases may help to illustrate the foregoing definitions of aphasia. The first is a boy fifteen years old whose aphasia was probably present originally on an organic basis following an accident, with a home-made bomb, in which he suffered a head injury; he was thirteen years old at the time of the accident. The aphasia is now thought to persist on a partially functional basis because of psychological conflict and blocking engendered by familial and environmental vicissitudes. On a performance test of intelligence, this lad performed at a level ten months above his chronological age. Audiometry indicates that his hearing is well within normal limits bilaterally. He produces sound and is able to articulate all speech sounds upon request with some auditory and motokinesthetic stimulation. His primary difficulty is in the recognition of visual language symbols; he also has difficulty in speaking and writing although he knows what he wants to communicate and can choose words accurately from a list given orally. His failures in symbolization are in marked contrast to his successes in areas where language is not necessary. His performance is superior until he has to read, write or talk; on occasions when he is under no compulsion, he is sometimes able to perform even these activities with relatively less difficulty; speaking is always less difficult than writing. This boy is aphasic. His linguistic behavior is impaired out of all proportion to any impedance of other activities.

A second case involves a boy six years old. On performance tests of intelligence, his behavior varied from three months below to six months above his chronological age level. He can reproduce accurately combinations of speech symbols, but he is almost completely unable to associate the words he produces with objects or situations or to produce any spontaneous speech that is meaningful or appropriate. Although he cannot understand or reply to questions asked by an examiner, his facial expression and pupillary reflexes indicate that he hears within normal limits the sounds produced by the pure tone audiometer. It has been established that he hears the sounds of conversational speech; he cannot, however, reproduce them without speech-reading. This child has no trouble in phonating; he is able to articulate any speech sound once he is given visual or kinesthetic stimulation. Auditory stimulation alone avails little even after intensive ear-training. The boy cannot retain and associate speech symbols. He is aphasic. His phonatory and articulatory apparatus is intact and capable of functioning for speech; he has intelligence; he cannot combine these factors to produce the conventional sound combinations that constitute meaningful speech. His disabilities are those affecting a concept of language and not the actual, mechanical reception and production of speech.

II

Aphasia cannot be defined, as has just been illustrated, without some description of its manifestations. The somewhat scattered descriptions of aphasic manifestations which were used to clarify and amplify the definitive statements in the preceding section may be augmented and summarized in outline form. This resume takes into account a speech pathologist's working concept of aphasia: aphasia is a linguistic impairment; there tend not to be "pure" or classical aphasias; each aphasic patient exhibits a complex disturbance made up of certain aphasic manifestations peculiar to the given case; any classification must be of aphasic manifestations and not of aphasias. Aphasic manifestations may be ob-

served and described under the several headings indicated:

I. Expressive manifestations
  A. Associative
  B. Overt or expressive
    1. Motor aphasia (spoken language)
    2. Agraphia (written language)
II. Receptive manifestations
  A. Auditory
    1. Agnosia (word-deafness)
    2. Aphasia (word-meaning-deafness)
  B. Visual
    1. Agnosia (word-blindness)
    2. Alexia (inability to read)
    3. Agraphia (inability to write)
    4. Anomia (inability to name objects)
  C. Other sensory media
    1. Tactile
    2. Cutaneous
    3. Kinesthetic
III. Associative manifestations
  A. Aphasia on lower levels (words, numbers, short sentences)
  B. Aphasia on higher levels (more complex combinations of symbols)
IV. Combinations of manifestations
  A. Wernicke's aphasia
  B. Total aphasia
  C. Other combinations of aphasic manifestations
V. Manifestations indicating special abilities
  A. Expressive
    1. Oral facility
    2. Manual facility
    3. Kinesthetic imagery
  B. Receptive
    1. Visual imagery
    2. Auditory
      a. Imagery
      b. Memory span
    3. Other sensory imagery (tactile, olfactory, gustatory, etc.)
  C. Associative

Every aphasia should be described briefly but specifically in terms of the observed aphasic manifestations. This habit of observation and written description tends to discourage the unjustified use of aphasia as a diagnostic term.

III

In order to differentiate an aphasic condition from others which may obscure it or otherwise prove confusing, it is essential to rule out defective hearing, faulty vision (in cases of suspected agraphia, alexia and anomia), inability to phonate, inability to articulate, general mental retardation and psychotic or neurotic conditions (of which, however, a functional aphasia may conceivably be a part). Audiometry, psychometry, and articulation testing must be adapted to the patient and administered in terms of his receptive and responsive abilities if aphasia is to be diagnosed accurately. There are some specific tests for aphasic manifestations, and parts of most standard tests of intelligence can be adapted to the needs of aphasic patients.[6] Neurological and psychiatric examination are indispensable to diagnostic verity. All tests must be adapted to a patient's former abilities as well as to his present ones. An individual who was unable to spell or to read English before a brain injury cannot reasonably be expected to do so afterward, although instances of improved behavior following cerebral insult have been recorded.

The necessity for differential diagnosis may be illustrated by a third case. A boy seven years old had been diagnosed as aphasic. Further examination indicated inability to raise and lower the velum voluntarily and inability to raise, lower or protrude the tongue; medical examination revealed the structure of the tongue to be sufficiently atypical to prevent adequate movement of it for the production of speech sounds. Audiometry indicated bilateral hearing loss between 40 and 50 decibels. This child performed at a level somewhat below his chronological age on a non-verbal test of intelligence; his I.Q., however, was .80, high enough to permit the develop-

[6] J. O. Anderson, *Aphasia from the Viewpoint of a Speech Pathologist* (Doctor's dissertation, Wisconsin, 1942), pp. 209, 240-249; Jon Eisenson, *Examining for Aphasia* (1946); and J. M. Neilsen, *op. cit.*, Chap. VIII.

ment of acceptable speech in the absence of other inhibiting factors. That the child understood language was evidenced by his carrying out of two- and three-part commands. The only speech sounds the boy could make intelligibly were [m] and [ɑ]. By working out a series of non-speech signals to permit communication between child and examiner, the youngster was taught to read and write about thirty-five words in a few weeks. When a child is so handicapped physically that he can produce only two speech sounds, the primary diagnosis is not aphasia.

IV

Aphasia is a specific diagnostic entity. Its manifestations are not to be confused with those of mental retardation, neurotic or psychotic states, severe articulatory impairment, inability to phonate, and deficient hearing. Such confusion will be minimized if speech correctionists and workers in adjacent areas will take the time and trouble to define, observe, and describe aphasic manifestations and to differentiate aphasic states from others with similar superficial symptomatologies. It would be ideal, of course, if this definition, observation, description, and differentiation could be accompanied by the guidance of an individual competent in the recognition, diagnosis, and treatment of aphasics.

An aphasia is present when an individual exhibits a disturbance of language, motor or sensory, due to a lesion of the brain in the absence of general mental deficit, faulty innervation of the musculature necessary for speech, or actual pathological involvement of the sense organs themselves.

ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE: A CHALLENGE TO THE SPEECH FIELD

AURORA M. QUIROS*

EACH year thousands of foreign students enter the United States to register in our colleges and universities. Thousands more will come in the next few years if world conditions permit, and if our educational institutions are equipped and staffed to care for larger enrollments. Most of these students from other countries arrive poorly prepared to understand and use the English language, and they are, therefore, handicapped in their studies. The linguistic problems raised by the large number of these students coming to study in the United States, students for whom English is a foreign language, present a challenge and an opportunity of real importance to departments of speech everywhere.

As the number of foreign students in this country has grown in the last few years, problems in connection with English as a second language have become increasingly apparent and pressing. It was early recognized that many of the difficulties encountered by the foreign student during his stay in a North American college or university were directly traceable to his lack of ability to cope with the new language, whether in professors' lectures or in informal, everyday, campus situations. The recognition of this problem has led a number of colleges and universities in the United States to establish special courses in English as a foreign language. Each institution in stepping into this relatively new field has, naturally, met its special academic and administrative problems in its own way, and has developed its own methods, techniques, and materials, since very little already existed which could be used. In many places, this type of English program has been developed through the cooperative and combined efforts of the speech, foreign languages, and English departments; in others, the program is part of the sub-freshman English review, or falls entirely into the speech department or the English department.

The primary purpose of this paper is to describe one program that has been developed in the University of California at Berkeley during the last four years. During the time that this program has been in operation, the number of foreign students taking part in it has increased from 33 the first semester to 175 last spring. A total of 500 students, representing over 60 countries, have taken part in this English instruction program. During the last year, the program has been extended to all the larger campuses of the University of California.

I

Previous to October, 1943, foreign students entering the University of California at Berkeley were given a brief examination, oral in nature, which attempted to ascertain if their knowledge of English was sufficient to permit them to pursue courses at the University. The examination was not rigid nor systematically developed to test proficiency in the various phases of written and spoken English; nor was there an English or speech course to which the students who did poorly could be directed.

Recognizing its responsibility to help

*Assistant Professor of Speech and Head of the English Instruction Program for Foreign Students, University of California.

these students overcome the language handicap in order to pursue their courses with greater profit to themselves and the countries they represent, the University of California, through the Department of Speech, in cooperation with International House, initiated in 1943 an experimental program in Oral English for foreign students.

The new program was primarily designed to meet the immediate and pressing need of the foreign student to express himself and to understand the English language in everyday situations and in his university studies. An incidental aim was to give to the students a better understanding and appreciation of the culture and customs of the United States. The general purpose of the program, therefore, is twofold: (1) instruction in the English language, and (2) orientation—to the University, to university studies, and to the United States.

As a result of experimentation for four years, the Foreign Student Oral English Program at the University of California now consists of the following activities:

First, an oral and written diagnostic entrance examination in English which is taken by every new foreign student, graduate and undergraduate. This examination follows the pattern of the University's regular examination in English for entering students, but it is designed for students to whom English is a foreign language. It tests the student's ability to speak, read, write, and understand English. If the examining committee concludes that the student's command of English is not adequate, the student is directed to enroll in one or the other of two special four-unit courses in Oral English for foreign students in the Department of Speech.

Second, the Director of the English Language Program advises and counsels each new foreign student concerning the direction and limit of his academic program.

Third, and possibly the most important part of the program are the special courses in Oral English designed for foreigners offered by the Department of Speech. Three courses have been developed: (1) Speech 25, a four academic unit course, which is an elementary review, required of those who barely pass in the entrance examination; (2) Speech 26, a four academic unit course, which is an intermediate review and which is a continuation of the first course; and (3) Speech 40, a three academic unit course, which is an advanced elective course.

It is to be noted that the students are divided into classes according to their ability to speak, read, write, and understand English. Even after this segregation, however, the classes are extremely heterogeneous, for they include students from freshmen to Doctors of Philosophy, of wide age range, and varied language and educational background. If it did not present almost insurmountable complications in a program which includes foreign students from all countries, a more ideal arrangement would, of course, be segregation not only with respect to level of [illegible] in English, but also according to language background. Some institutions have devoted themselves exclusively to special language groups, the Latin-American or Chinese, for example. To meet this problem in the program at Berkeley, which is not restricted to any one language group, classes are kept small and are broken down into sections of two or three students for special intensive drill and laboratory work. Special consultation hours also play an important role in the program.

II

The two basic courses which have been developed have the following activities as a core: first, a thorough review and drill on grammar and sentence structure, presented from a foreign language point of view. These courses call for instructors, not necessarily multi-lingual, who have had training in the English *language*, who have some knowledge of the basic structure of some other languages, and who possess as wide a cultural and linguistic background as possible. An instructor with such a background can more easily understand, analyze, and correct the errors made by a person learning English as a foreign language, so different from the errors made by an American student.

The principles of English grammar and word order are presented from a foreign language point of view, step by step, at whatever speed is permitted by the ability of the class to thoroughly assimilate the material. Much emphasis is given to practice exercises. Constant repetition and drill on each point presented are indispensable. The textbook used in the grammar class is a syllabus we have compiled which includes the fundamentals of English for a foreign student and many graded drill exercises.

In this class one written composition a [illegible] each student. These [illegible] in length from 25- to 50-word pa[illegible]aphs at the beginning of the first course to three or four hundred word essays at the end. These written assignments may be original themes on assigned or suggested topics, or may take the form of a summary or a précis of a lecture or of material read by or to the class.

Notetaking and outlining, vocabulary and idiom study also receive emphasis in this part of the program. Frequently used idiomatic words and constructions have been worked into conversations, dialogues, and brief stories which comprise the "Word Study" section of the syllabus which has been developed for use in these courses.

The second activity of the Oral English courses centers in the pronunciation class. In the section devoted to pronunciation, emphasis is placed on the explanation of, and drill on, the formation of correct speech sounds in English, and on intonation and inflection pattern. Numerous exercises have been worked out for each speech sound, in isolation, in various positions in words, in sentences and in connected paragraphs. Constant drill and repetition under the guidance of the instructor or an assistant have been found to be indispensable in the pronunciation work. In addition to work on English sounds and inflection pattern, oral reading, short speeches, discussions, ear training, and frequent dictation are also included in the pronunciation class.

Particularly apparent in this work is the problem of individual differences and needs. To meet this problem, small groups, made up of two or three students with the same native language, meet once or twice a week with an American drill leader for intensive work on pronunciation problems peculiar to the individual or to students of English of a particular foreign langua[illegible] background. These small sections are also used to make frequent recordings of the students' pronunciation for [illegible]alysis of defects and check on progre[illegible]

The pronun[illegible]ion part of the work is of extreme i[illegible]ortance, for usually a student who comes to the United States with even a fairly adequate background in English grammar at first finds rapid, spoken English a jumbled chaos of unintelligible sounds. His ear cannot resolve the speech noises he hears into words and ideas, and his own pronun-

ciation of English makes it very difficult for him to be understood.

This aspect of teaching Speech-English as a foreign language is, of course, not new to the speech fields of phonetics and of the correction of articulatory defects and accent. The basic problems in the foreign student speech situation are essentially the same with, perhaps, a variation in approach and details, since, for this type of student, the matter is complicated somewhat by the fact that his language background is other than English.

III

The third aspect of the program at the University of California is called "Orientation." It aims at increasing the foreign student's understanding of the United States, its institutions, culture and life, and at facilitating his adaptation to this country and to the demands of university life. Too often, a student from abroad spends a year or two in the United States pursuing his studies, and because of the necessity for specialization and concentration in his own field, returns to his own country, possibly with a degree from one of our colleges, but little broader in his understanding of the United States, and perhaps still carrying the too prevalent prejudices and misconceptions of it which he had when he arrived.

In the orientation class, through the reading material, through special activities such as movies, discussions, and guest lectures on American art, government, literature, our libraries, customs, etc., an attempt is made to present a fair picture of our culture and to increase the foreign student's understanding and appreciation of it. All of these activities are correlated with speech, composition, summarizing or notetaking assignments. In these assignments and in discussions connected with these activities, the students often discuss related problems and topics concerning their own countries. The motivation to converse and discuss in English is strong and the resultant sharing of ideas and opinions of value. Such an approach to an important angle of the foreign student field, it is believed, is not only helpful to the learning of English but a positive method for exchanging views and presenting the United States to these men and women from other lands without unsubtle preaching or propaganda. The results of this activity are of value to the student of English, and in the long run, may prove of even greater importance to us.

The classes in the program at the University of California presuppose that the foreign student has had a little previous background in English, for the lessons are conducted entirely in English from the beginning. Students who know no English whatsoever, therefore, cannot participate in the program at this time, nor can they enter the University, where, because of rulings of the Immigration Service, they are required to take at least twelve units of academic work.

Unfortunately, because of heavy enrollment, the University has been forced to exclude temporarily all foreign students from the Lower Division. In spite of this, however, there are at present six sections of the work in Oral English. When the present emergency is over, there will undoubtedly be a flood of foreign students from devastated countries admitted to the University, and the program will probably be greatly enlarged.

A RE-EVALUATION OF SPEECH OBJECTIVES

HEROLD LILLYWHITE*

IN his article, "Improving the Fundamentals Course," in the December, 1946 number, of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, D. P. McKelvey outlined what he calls a "fundamentals sequence" of courses for the Stanford speech program. It was not his thesis to urge other schools to establish the same kind of sequence as that at Stanford, but rather to re-examine the basic speech courses, the quality of instruction, and the needs of the students in these courses; then to make revisions of the fundamentals courses in light of established needs. With this thesis there can be no fundamental disagreement. Mr. McKelvey's point is well taken and his procedure seems essentially sound. But Stanford's solution to the problem must give serious pause to many experienced teachers of speech.

Apparently Stanford is building its basic courses around a core of voice training. All else is secondary to that core. And yet Stanford calls that a "fundamentals sequence." We may well ask, "fundamental to what?" Surely there must be something more fundamental in effective communication than voice training. If not, then a great majority of the speech teachers in the country are guilty of perpetrating a grave injustice to the students they teach and to the institutions in which they work. If this is the most fundamental aspect of speech training, we may as well turn it all over to the music departments.

Granted that excellent voices are a distinct asset in communication, no unbiased speech teacher will deny that it is possible to be an effective speaker and still possess a rather serious voice handicap. It is even possible to teach speech effectively, or at least to hold positions as speech teachers for many years, and still possess voices of unpleasant quality! If one is inclined to doubt this statement, let him attend the next local, regional, or national speech convention and lend a critical ear to the speakers there. And many of them will make excellent speeches—in spite of bad voices.

We may be justified in asking at this point if it isn't about time that we stop kidding ourselves about the effectiveness of most of the hocus pocus of breathing exercises and vocal gymnastics that we are constantly using in an attempt to improve the effectiveness of oral communication, especially when these mystic rites are administered en masse as they must be in large fundamentals classes. We ought some day to admit that much of this is just so much window-dressing to impress our nonspeech colleagues and the gullible public.

All of which is by way of introduction of my own purpose: to state what appears to me to be fundamental in speech training. I recently had the stimulating and confusing task of setting up an entire speech curriculum for a small liberal arts college (enrollment about 1000). It was a stimulating task because it led me to ask many searching questions and to try to find the answers. It was confusing because my search led to such a body of divergent, apparently indiscriminate, unplanned speech offerings that it was impossible to find a definite conception of what speech training should be, or a clearly defined objective or set of objectives for either

*Professor of Speech and Chairman of the Department of Speech and Dramatics, Whittier College.

the fundamental courses or the entire program.

My task did, however, compel me to state my own philosophy of speech and to attempt to define an over-all objective for a college speech program. For what it may be worth, a statement of that philosophy and objective is presented here. This statement is not presented as the only answer, but in the expectation that it may stimulate further questioning.

I

Speech instructors and speech curricula have long concentrated upon the achievement of skill in the manipulation of language symbols and speech organs, apparently on the assumption that the developing of such a skill should be the ultimate objective in the speech training program. Such a supposition seems to underlie the voice training "fundamental sequence" at Stanford. Surely speech involves more than the mechanics of the speech process. Skill in the mechanics of speech is an important part of speech training, but certainly not all of it.

Could we not say that speech is also an expression of the entire personality of an individual through a system of language symbols, the precise understanding of which is dependent not only upon the symbols themselves, but upon the intentional and unintentional meanings of the speaker and the intentional and unintentional interpretations of the listener? These meanings and interpretations of meanings of the same set of symbols are determined by the entire environmental and developmental backgrounds of the individuals involved, plus the immediate mental and emotional colorings of their hopes, desires, fears, prejudices and beliefs. Thus the manner in which the individual attempts to manipulate his environments through speech for the satisfaction of his psycho-social and psycho-somatic needs is determined by the entire sum of his experiences and immediate pressures.

This conception seems to overcomplicate what has often been a relatively simple definition, but it is probable that the definition of speech has been oversimplified to the point of complete misunderstanding of its function in the process of human relationships. There is no simplicity about the process of communication through speech or about the mechanics of the use of language itself. Speech is the most highly complicated and refined process that the organism of modern man has been called upon to produce. As such it involves the entire organism with all its complexities. This concept seems basic to a workable philosophy of speech.

If this be true, the school speech program must be built upon a broad basis of training for personality integration, social adjustment, and an understanding of the nature of language and language skills rather than upon the usual narrow structure of an isolated process of oral manipulation of language symbols. An understanding of the elementary semantic aspects is surely fundamental, as is an insight into the basic human motives and the mental and emotional aspects of the individual personality as they express themselves through speech and the interpretation of speech. Skill in the use of language symbols and vocal manipulation, while highly important, is secondary to these basic understandings. How, then, can we teach the "fundamentals" of speech by beginning and ending with what is secondary in the beginning course?

Proceeding on this conception of what is fundamental in oral communication, the speech program would aim primarily at helping the individual to see himself in true relation to the whole of his social

and individual environments. This he would approach through discussion, conversation, listening, platform and radio speaking, the dramatic portrayal of characters on the stage and radio, and cooperative activity in the production of dramatic and radio programs. In all of these communicative activities a definite effort would be made to integrate information and ideas from all of the areas of human knowledge. Since speech is the key process in social intercourse, it should also become the key integrating factor in education.

Speech classes are ideally suited to the formulating and expressing of ideas and information from all classroom and out-of-class experience. This process becomes vital and worthwhile, however, only when it becomes an interpretative process, a critical evaluation of influences and events in one's environment, rather than a speech exercise aimed solely at gaining skill in articulation or developing diaphragmatic breathing.

The speech training, then, performs the dual purpose of integrating and interpreting information and ideas as well as integrating and interpreting the individual personality. This integration and interpretation will not happen, however, by itself. It requires expert instruction and pointed guidance in the right direction. The secondary objective of achieving facility in the mechanics of speech is also gained without making it the end result. Skill in the use of language is looked upon as a necessity for satisfactory human relationships and as a means for more adequately integrating the forces in one's environment and in oneself, rather than as an end in itself.

II

Such a philosophy of speech rests upon the belief that an individual communicates effectively, before a large audience, in conversation with a friend, as a member of a discussion group, at a public forum, before a microphone or behind footlights, only when he possesses an understanding of the basic nature of language, an insight into his own behavior and personality traits as well as those of people around him; when he possesses mental alertness, curiosity, and information concerning all of the areas of living, and when he has gained a personal philosophy that is consistent with a satisfactory and useful way of life. He must have adequate skill in speaking and any mechanical defects of speech must be remedied, but without the more fundamental understandings he will remain ineffectual and superficial in his social intercourse.

The fundamentals course becomes, then, the most important course in the entire speech curriculum. Instead of assigning teaching assistants and the least well-trained instructors to teach this course, it should be taught by the most highly trained and experienced staff members. It is in this course that the conception of the process of communication should be developed and the relation of speech to other skills and areas of knowledge and information as well as to daily living is established. In this course much attention to the mental mechanisms of the individual and to his general social and personal adjustment must be given. Much of the speaking would be autobiographical in nature with the purpose of establishing a searching objectivity and insight into one's self and one's associates, not to the point of excessive introspection, but approaching intelligent understanding. Speech organization, composition, and delivery would be taught as effective methods of achieving this objectivity and insight rather than as techniques of value in themselves.

All of the other speech courses and

out-of-class speech activities spring from and build upon the basic course, developing the principles and techniques begun there. While the more advanced courses would have varied and more specific immediate objectives, they would all be built toward the greater objective: the development, through oral communication, of specific skills and understandings for the art of living. It is realized that this objective has long been in the background of speech training, supposedly the eventual result of all courses, but it is emphasized again that a much more direct and positive approach to it must be made. Like so many of our distant objectives in education, the over-all objective of speech training will never be reached unless it is held constantly and vividly before our students and unless all we do is pointed directly toward it.

III

It is not my intention to imply that speech training begins and ends with the broad and general objective suggested. Certainly our immediate objectives and procedures must be much more specific in all speech courses. Such aspects of speech as delivery, organization, voice training, articulation and diction drill are highly important and are definitely a part of our task. My contention is that they are not the most fundamental aspects in speech, and, therefore, should not constitute the basis for the fundamentals courses.

It would seem to be evident that such detailed instruction as voice training should be on an individual basis, recommended after careful examination has shown the need for a specific kind of training for an individual. Thus the courses in voice and diction, public speaking, and interpretation, as well as the speech correction center can be utilized to give this kind of aid to students rather than subjecting everyone to mass vocal exercises in the fundamentals classes. Without something more fundamental than this in speech training why should we bother to correct such faults as unpleasant voices?

If I have misrepresented or distorted Mr. McKelvey's ideas or the Stanford speech program in any way it was unintentional. What appears to be the Stanford conception of speech fundamentals has been used in this article because it seems to represent so clearly one of the many conceptions of fundamental speech training that can be found in schools over the nation and that seem to me to be superficial and unsound as bases upon which to build sound and constructive speech programs. My purpose in writing seems to be much the same as that of Mr. McKelvey: to stimulate a re-examination of our fundamental thinking on speech training. My own re-examination has resulted in a conception quite different from that presented by Mr. McKelvey. Continued search will, perhaps, lead us to a stable fundamental program somewhere midway between these two conceptions. What is important is that we continue the search.

SPEECH TRAINING IN NEGRO COLLEGES

MARCUS H. BOULWARE*

UNTIL 1940 there were no recognized departments of speech in Negro colleges. Up to that time speech training was mainly offered by English departments whose staffs had very little training in speech. Today Tennessee A. & I. College, Nashville, Tennessee, is the only Negro college with a speech department offering a major and minor in speech. For almost two decades Fisk University, Dillard University, Howard University, and West Virginia State College have offered a major or minor in drama, but the general speech area has been neglected. During the past ten years, however, there has been a growing emphasis upon including speech courses in the curricula of Negro colleges.

The reader must not think of speech training in the Negro college as something different from that taking place in other colleges. "Speech," says Dr. Lillian Voorhees, "is a human experience, qualified, it is true by environmental, psychological, and other background factors, but essentially the same regardless of artificial, national, and racial barriers present in our civilization. It will probably be conceded, also, that fewer differences appear in the speech of different racial groups on the higher cultural levels where there is similarity of background and training such as we have in the college-bred person of both races. Speech then in the Negro college is not essentially different from that in any other college."[1] Negro college students strive to speak Southern English as used by the best speakers of that region. In spite of the fact that many of them have been trained in inferior, segregated schools of the South, they are responsive to the idea that they must learn to adapt their speech to that which prevails in the best professional, regional, or social circles.

In this country, and especially in the South, there is, of course, the problem of heritage and tradition which cripples and handicaps the speech of colored students, but this does not mean that Negro dialect is the characteristic speech of the educated colored people. "It requires great courage for a sensitive Negro student to face a world in which, no matter how keen his mind, how great his ambition and accomplishments, he must accept the fact that he is thought inferior and will be denied certain rights and privileges accorded to white citizens, as well as the respect he could demand were his skin not dark."[2] In view of this fact, it is surprising not to find more speech defects of a psychological nature than is the case.

I

According to the *United States Educational Directory*, there are 103 Negro institutions doing work on the college level. Of this number, 13 are private schools, 48 are denominational, 43 are supported by the states, 5 are junior colleges, 8 are normal schools offering two or three years of training, 7 are supported by cities, 9 are four-year teachers colleges, and one is supported by the Federal Government. Statistics show further that two of these institutions are professional schools of theology, while five colleges have schools of theology

*Instructor in English and Speech, Carver High School, Phoenix, Arizona.

[1] Lillian W. Voorhees, "Speech in the Negro College, *The Talladegan*, LVII (May, 1940), p. 1.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

offering degrees. Two law schools are operating at two universities and one at another college, while one university has a school of medicine. Another medical school,[3] not affiliated with any university, is located in Nashville, Tennessee.

The enrollment at these colleges is made up mostly of colored students who live in the United States, and a few come from foreign countries. Practically ever since it has existed, Lincoln University in Pennsylvania has had a few white students, mainly children of white professors who taught at the school. The faculties of these colleges are almost entirely made up of Negro teachers. Fisk University, Hampton Institute, Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, and Talladega College have biracial staffs, colored and white.

In order to secure data concerning the teaching of speech in these colleges, an inquiry blank was formulated and sent to each school. It included questions requesting information concerning the speech courses offered, the use of speech tests, major and minor offerings in speech, training of the speech staff, the extracurricular program, the required courses in speech, practice teaching facilities, availability of the services of a clinic, and the prevalence of speech departments in administrative units. I shall report here on the extent and general character of speech education in these colleges.

Seventy-two out of the 103 colleges responded to the questionnaire; 61 sent catalogs; 25 sent personal letters, and six promised to forward catalogs as soon as they were released by the press. Personal letters were sent to all of the schools of theology which were requested to discuss the nature of speech training in their curricula, and four of them responded. The results of the inquiry are summarized below.

[3] Meharry Medical College, Nashville, Tennessee.

NUMBER OF COLLEGES OFFERING COURSES IN SPEECH

Debate and Discussion	
Debate	26
Public Speaking and Debate	2
Public Discussion	3
Parliamentary Law	1
Dramatic Production	
Study of Drama and Theatre	19
Play Production	60
Playwriting	2
Radio Drama	3
Oral Interpretation	
Oral Interpretation of Literature	7
Advanced Oral Interpretation	1
Choral Speaking	2
Story Telling	1
Speaking	
Fundamentals of Speech	27
Oral English	8
Public Address and Oratory	53
Psychological and Clinical Speech	3
Phonetics and Science	5
Speech Education	3
Course Listed as English	
English Drama and Shakespeare	28
Negro Drama	1
History and Survey of Drama	12
Greek Drama	1
Modern Drama	10
Extracurricular Speech	
Dramatic Societies	59
Debate Societies	22
Speaking and Oratorical Contests	15
Radio Clubs	1
Debate Awards and Trophies	7
Debate Awards and Keys	2
Discussion Forums	3

Six colleges reported that they didn't offer any courses in speech. Two of these schools, however, required freshmen and sophomores to deliver speeches and declamations in chapel before the student body. For these performances, students earned one hour of credit each semester.

II

Speech training had long been included in the curricula of white colleges and

universities when the first Negro colleges were organized after the outbreak of the Civil War. These colleges started as grammar and preparatory schools, and it was near the turn of the century before they offered work on the collegiate level. It is doubtful, if the rules of the best college rating agencies were applied, that any of the colleges would have been rated "A" before the year 1913. Harvard had been established approximately 200 years, and Yale over 125 years when the first Negro received his bachelor's degree; but even so, the higher reaches of education were still for the privileged few. According to Charles S. Johnson in his volume, *The Negro College Graduate*, only 28 Negroes had graduated from college at the outbreak of the Civil War.[4]

The Civil War freed four million slaves who were mostly illiterate. The wide social chasm between the master and slave would not permit the acceptance of the idea of a public school system in the South for all people regardless of race. Consequently there originated a segregated and inferior school system for Negroes. Most of the work of educating the freedmen at first was done by missionary societies and the Freedmen's Bureau. The first task was that of teaching colored people the rudiments of education—reading, writing, and arithmetic. As soon as children exhibited progress, they were encouraged to give declamations and oral readings.

Around 1913, the curricula of most Negro colleges were beginning to include work of recognized collegiate rank. In 1914 there were 255 degrees granted by Negro colleges alone. By 1936 these colleges were conferring degrees upon nearly 1800 students annually. It can be safely estimated that by 1950 more than 5,000 students will be graduated annually from these institutions.

Practically all Negro colleges during the latter half of the nineteenth century had literary societies which offered opportunities for writing, speaking, and declaiming. Johnson C. Smith University,[5] Charlotte, North Carolina, had the *Matoon Literary Society*. According to its president, Dr. William Dinkins, Selma University in Alabama had a literary society as early as 1893. "In the late 1890's," said President Dinkins, "and perhaps before then, there were a young men's debating society and the *Athenian Literary Society* for women. Later, and at present, we have the *Douglass Literary Society* for men and women." Dean Leroy D. Johnson of Storer College, Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, states that at that institution class declamations were held as early as 1890, and that the *Lincoln Debating Society* was organized in 1895. Referring to club organizations, the catalog for 1899 said: "They will be conducted by students, will meet weekly, and will furnish abundant opportunity for drill in reading, speaking, composition, and parliamentary law."

It was in 1907 that the first course in speech was offered at the A. and T. College, Greensboro, North Carolina. The expansion of separate courses in speech received no impetus until 1920 when Virginia State College offered its first course. In that same year, Bluefield State Teachers College inaugurated a course of study in speech. One reads in the catalog, ". . . forms of speech are designated as a part of the English course, Second Year Rhetoric and Composition. Special stress on the four forms of discourse, description, narration, exposition, and argument." In 1924 Wiley College, Marshall, Texas, introduced a speech course;

[4] Charles S. Johnson, *The Negro College Graduate* (Chapel Hill, 1938), p. 7.

[5] Biddle University before 1920.

two years later Xavier University, New Orleans, offered for the first time a two-hour course in speech for freshmen and sophomores. Tillotson College, Austin, Texas, offered its first course in speech in 1930. The State Teachers College, Montgomery, Alabama, started a course in public speaking in 1930, but after that year, the course was not offered again for ten years. In 1930 a speech course was included in the curriculum of Lincoln University in Pennsylvania. Princess Anne College, Maryland, set up its first course in speech in 1938, and the next year Georgia State College prescribed a course in speech. By 1940 Bluefield State Teachers College in West Virginia had expanded its curriculum to include two speech courses, one giving technical instruction in the basic principles of speech, the other entitled "The Principles of Persuasive Speech and Debate." Since 1940 many colleges have enriched their speech offerings. Tennessee A. and I. College is leading the way, because so far as I know, it is the only Negro college offering a major and minor in speech.

III

In those Negro schools where no majors and minors are offered, but where speech courses are available, the programs are recognized as having value and significance.

Dr. Ruth Harris, President of Stowe Teachers College, St. Louis, says,

> Our speech comes in the first year, as a requirement for all students in our institution, Teachers College and Junior College alike. The speech unit is connected with the English Composition Workshop and grows out of the needs of the students during their freshman year. During the second, third, and fourth years, clinical services are available for any student who needs the same.

President E. A. Clark, Miner Teachers College, Washington, D. C., gives valuable information regarding speech work at that institution. He says:

> You will note from this material [sent to author] that Miner offers courses in speech arts, public speaking, and play production. In addition to this, the school has a speech clinic. All freshmen are screened for speech defects as part of their entrance examination. Those with serious defects are eliminated as physically incapacitated to become teachers. Those with remedial defects are placed in a clinic where remedial measures are taken to correct their defects. Each student has a recording of his voice at the beginning of this remedial program, and at appropriate intervals in order that he may detect and work on these defects which are characteristic of his speech.

The State Teachers College, Montgomery, Alabama, has a communications center under the direction of Maurice A. Lee. The speech area outline is as follows:

I. Speech training has two aspects, remedial and developmental

II. Remedial training includes:
  - A. Determination of student's initial ability in basic skills of articulation, enunciation, and pronunciation
  - B. Determination of initial abilities in tone and pitch qualities
    1. An initial voice recording is made
    2. After training a terminal recording is made for evaluating progress made
    3. Nature of training given is determined by need of each individual in such areas

III. Developmental training is as follows:
  - A. Requiring the student to construct and deliver various types of speeches
  - B. Providing opportunities for the student to take part in various "interest" activities such as debating, radio plays, radio newscasting, roundtable, and panel discussion, story telling, etc. In these activities, these things are considered:
    1. Basic abilities
    2. Effective gesturing, display of mannerism, posture
    3. Rapport with listeners
    4. Effective interpretation
    5. Correct grammatical form
    6. Control of breathing
  - C. Integrating speaking activities with other communicative forms, such as writing, reading, and listening

IV. Evaluating the student's progress
  A. Determination of his advance in basic skills
  B. Determination of his acquisition of desirable habits and attitudes, such as persistence in overcoming difficulties, self-criticism, self-motivation, co-operativeness, etc.

Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia, conducts a Communications Center which trains students in the areas of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Subjects include composition, literature, speech, French, Spanish, and German. The following courses in speech are offered: speech laboratory, psychology of reading and speech, radio workshop, theatre workshop, clinical practices, dramatic survey.

At Talladega College in Alabama, Dr. Lillian Voorhees who taught there from 1928 to 1943 provides the following information. When she went to this college in 1928, there was only one course offered in speech. Public speaking was required of all students. There was no course in dramatics. There was added a course in dramatic production, one in dramatic interpretation, and one in dramatic composition. For a number of years she taught Shakespeare and a class in verse forms. When the college changed its curriculum to a general program, several changes were made. Instead of requiring a course in public speaking, a course in foundations of speech was given two days a week throughout the freshman year along with the course in English. A recording machine was purchased and each freshman made recordings. Studio work was required of students having defects in speech. A general second course was introduced which consisted of any phase of speech the class chose in accordance with their interests and needs. Often it included considerable public speaking.

In the Major Division of Talladega College, students were permitted to elect dramatic composition, dramatic interpretation, or dramatic production (in which they had experience in directing a play). Phonetics or Advanced Speech was designed for those who planned to follow vocations in which speech would be a prominent factor.

Now a member of the staff of Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee, Dr. Voorhees reports:

> Every freshman is required to meet in speech class once a week as part of his English work. It was intended that each freshman should make a recording, but the school was unable to get the speech laboratory started because of priorities on machines, etc. Fisk University does not offer a major in drama, because of inadequate speech staff; but it does retain the drama minor. Several new courses in speech and drama have been added. There is also a course in public speaking which has been in existence for some time.

Theological schools also give attention to speech needs. Dean William S. Nelson, Howard University School of Religion, states that practice preaching is offered in the course in Homiletics. A student is asked to preach before his class. He is corrected by the instructor and his classmates and graded on the basis of the quality of his work. Commenting on speech training at Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Georgia, Frank W. Clelland says, "For the past nine years only one semester's course of two hours has been offered in speech training. Our students get some additional training in courses in Homiletics, and the Making and Delivering of Sermons." Dr. Charles H. Shute, Dean of Theological School, Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, North Carolina, says, "As far back as recollection goes, practice preaching in one form or another has been carried on in this school. The work was once confined to the classroom with only theological students

as audiences. Later, the exercise was carried to the chapel where speakers had much larger audiences, consisting of the general student body and faculty members. At present, in addition to practice preaching in the classroom, students preach at the mid-week prayer service. As an incentive to greater interest and effort the H. Beecher Jackson Homiletics Prize is offered the one excelling in that subject." Dr. R. A. Goodwin of the Payne Divinity School, Petersburg, Virginia, states that this seminary gives careful instruction and much practice work in public speaking in the junior, middle, and senior years. In the junior year, student ministers preach in class. In the middle and seniors years, they preach in chapel and in nearby mission churches.

To promote an interest in the speech and drama subjects in Negro colleges, the Southern Association of Drama and Speech Arts was formed. Since its beginning in 1933, drama has been stressed at the annual conferences. In 1926 a pentagonal debating league was formed and operated for approximately fifteen years. It included at first Johnson C. Smith University, Talladega College, Fisk University, Morehouse College, and Knoxville College. During the fall of 1945, the Southwestern Intercollegiate Debate League was formed in order to revive debating that was discontinued during the war.

We may perhaps say, in conclusion, that speech education in Negro colleges, although impeded by forces that have retarded Negro education generally, is making encouraging progress.

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE HIGH SCHOOL ASSEMBLY

THEODORE SKINNER*

THERE are at least three good reasons why a speech and drama teacher should welcome the opportunity to act as chairman of the school assembly committee. First, the job will probably be assigned to him anyway. Second, the assembly affords an excellent motivation and outlet for speech and drama class work. Third, by having charge of the scheduling of assembly programs, he can avoid conflicts with set construction and rehearsals for school plays by arranging, at such times, for the type of program which requires a simple staging. As a former chairman of the assembly program committee in the high school at Boulder, Colorado, I can testify to the soundness of these reasons. I hope now to offer some practical suggestions to teachers of speech who often shoulder the major responsibility for the assembly program.

I

The personnel of the assembly committee is all important. A committee made up of both students and faculty members proved successful for us. The students might come from the student council and represent all of the three or four classes of the school. The faculty members should be those who can be depended upon to contribute ideas; they might well represent the music, physical education, art, and social studies departments, among others.

It is the committee which will have to determine the purpose of the assembly. We found that assembly programs may serve both entertainment and education; indeed, they *may* entertain and educate at the same time. Furthermore, the assembly period should serve the students—both those on the stage and those in the audience. In fact, the committee will do well to integrate the program with the master aims of education: *self-realization, happy human relations, economic efficiency*, and *civic responsibility*. Later, programs will be suggested, each of which will meet one or more of these objectives.

With the purpose of the assembly in mind, the committee has the responsibility of blocking out the schedule. One of the first steps the committee can take is to review the programs of the preceding year. One finds out what has been done and which departments in the school will be most likely to want to sponsor programs. At the beginning of each school year in the Boulder High School, a ballot listing all the programs of the preceding year was submitted to all students in their home rooms. They were asked to rank the programs in order of popularity. On the ballot were blank spaces for suggestions of new types of assemblies. Such polling served both to arouse the interest of students in assemblies and to give them a part in determining the programs. Furthermore, by publicizing of the results of the poll in the school paper, the students demanded that the most popular programs be repeated. From year to year, the most popular programs were the exchange assemblies. This type of program will be discussed later.

Frequent meetings of the assembly committee early in the year in order to schedule programs for the semester, or preferably for the entire year, reduces the number of meetings later on and

*Professor of Speech and Chairman of the Department of Speech, Texas College of Arts and Industries.

tends to prevent the hastily-thrown-together type of program. The schedule should include the date, the nature of the program, and the sponsoring group. In any fair-sized high school, there is enough interest and talent among the student body to provide for weekly assemblies. After scheduling the first six or eight assemblies, it is wise to leave one open date each month to provide for unanticipated requests for assembly time. (However, the committee should arrange a program for these dates at least two weeks in advance). In arranging the schedule, the committee should check to see that the programs have variety and that similar types of programs are spaced so as not to fall on succeeding weeks.

Certain departments and organizations in the school can be depended upon to request assembly dates—for example, the music department. The band is benefited by appearing before the school, and the student body should be glad to give the band this opportunity. Both the band and orchestra are apt to want dates shortly prior to the district or state music festival. The choir, or the boys and girls glee clubs, will want a date or two during the year. Speech and drama classes ordinarily welcome an opportunity to present two or three programs a year. The physical education department may wish to give a gym exhibit, or hold finals in boxing, wrestling, or other athletic contests during assembly time.

II

The exchange assembly is extremely popular with students. This plan calls for the exchange of programs with other high schools. Each year, Boulder High School sends students to other high schools in the Northern Colorado League, as well as to other neighboring schools, to present an assembly program, and receives a program in exchange. As many as six exchanges are made during the school year. Because of the competitive element, each school can be depended upon to give a polished and usually an original program. So popular is the exchange plan that when tryouts are held for numbers or acts, the assembly committee views more than three times the number needed. Although it would be possible to take the same program to several schools, we worked up new ones for each exchange trip in order to use more students.

On our last trip just after gas rationing hit us, we took thirty students on an all day trip, giving a program at Greeley in the morning and Fort Collins in the afternoon. This program was built around the television radio idea, the program supposedly coming from Station "BHS." The acts consisted of the girls of the triple trio appearing in Western costumes singing cowboy songs around a campfire, four couples from the Spanish Club dancing tango numbers, a three man tumbling team (who trucked their own springboard and mats), a magician, the return of the triple trio—this time in evening dresses—singing popular and semiclassical songs, a comedy skit, and a boy who did a show-stopping (and ending) boogie-woogie number on a "hot" trumpet. Even after gas rationing, we took twenty-five students by train to present a program at the Longmont High School.

The exchange assembly program serves a triple purpose, in that it provides a program for one's own school, gives students the benefit of a repeat performance before another audience, and brings a program from another school before one's own students. Incidentally, one of the by-products of this type of assembly is the improvement in the relationships between the schools.

(The exchange assembly has been discussed in considerable detail because it was so successful, and proved to be extremely popular with the students).

Another type of program is that which is built around important dates or holidays. Although this kind of program can be very effective, it should not be overdone. It is a bit monotonous to have assemblies celebrating Washington's, Lincoln's, and Jefferson's birthdays during the same year. There are certain times during the year when students are more receptive to such programs, the obvious seasons being Christmas and Easter.

Many schools bring in outside programs in the form of various professional school assembly companies. Although there are some arguments in favor of such programs, I feel that the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages. In the first place, they deprive the students of the opportunity of presenting the program. Second, often they consist of Class C vaudeville talent. Third, if money is going to be spent buying programs, it would seem wiser to use it for stage decoration for original assemblies, for buying good movie films, and for providing transportation for such programs as the exchange assemblies. Probably the professional assemblies are used in many cases because they provide an easy out for the assembly committee.

If the school owns a movie projector, movie assemblies are a possibility. Since it is usually impossible for a school to own a projector which can compete with those of the local movie houses, it is a waste of time to bring in feature films. The length of such films is against their use, also. Only those which have educational value—the documentary films for example—should be given in schools. The committee should encourage teachers to conduct follow-up duscussions in classes in order to derive the greatest educational value from the use of films in assemblies.

Another responsibility of the assembly committee is that of training the student body in proper auditorium conduct. Undoubtedly the best way to gain proper conduct on the part of the audience is to present good programs that hold the attention and interest of students. But it also seems advisable to follow certain practices in arranging for students to enter and leave the auditorium, as well as to govern their behavior while in the room. The question of the seating of students is a debatable one. Some believe that students should be allowed to choose their seats from one week to the next; but there seems to be no more reason to permit this than to allow students to choose their seats from day to day in the classroom. Unless students occupy regularly assigned seats, there is apt to be delay and confusion in getting the program under way.

Student conduct, furthermore, can be controlled somewhat through an orientation session early in the year. We told students the general plans for assemblies, about the ballot which would be distributed later, and gave some rules concerning the part the audience plays in assemblies. The latter include such matters as courtesy toward performers (whether students or guests), how to applaud, when to applaud and when not to applaud, and recognition of the time element which means that there will be no encores unless announced. Naturally, such a session has to be handled skillfully, but it does seem that students have a right to know what is expected of them, and how they can contribute toward the success of the assembly. At the close of this short meeting the next week's program may be announced, and the groups then return to their home rooms where

they fill out the ballots. Many variations of this plan could be followed, but some such orientation seems advisable.

Finally, the task of the assembly program committee is not just one of finding programs to fill up the year's schedule, but rather one of selecting from the wide range of possibilities those programs which will best challenge the talents and interests of the students, both those on the stage and those in the audience. The right to public assemblage is an American right. It is through the assembly that the schools can contribute immeasurably to the education of the American youth. The challenge to those in charge is great and the reward is even greater.

III

Some Guiding Ideas For Assemblies

A. *General Policy*

1. Thirty minutes is probably the best length; few programs can run successfully beyond 40 minutes.
2. Programs should be decided upon well in advance of the date scheduled, so as to allow for sufficient rehearsal.
3. If possible, pep rally assemblies should be held in the school gymnasium instead of in the auditorium.
4. Routine announcements should be held to a minimum, if not eliminated entirely.
5. Assemblies should not be used as a means of raising money. All programs should be free and open to all students.
6. Work for wide participation among the student body. See how *many* students can be used throughout the year. Avoid having the same group present all the programs.
7. Have *students* preside over assemblies, not *faculty members*. (This does not mean that faculty members should not appear before students. Obviously, the school should avail itself, occasionally, of faculty members who are talented.)
8. See that assembly programs are publicized in the local papers, and that townspeople are invited to attend.
9. Work for variety among the various programs.
10. The assembly committee should follow up the appearance of guest performances with letters of appreciation.

B. *Preparation of Programs*

1. Programs should be timed to match as closely as possible the established assembly period.
2. Rehearsals should be held in the auditorium. The assembly committee should have representatives to preview each program.
3. Programs should be publicized in the school paper so that students will know what *type* of program to expect. An announcement of the next program might be made at each assembly.
4. Careful attention should be paid to the setting, costuming, properties, lighting, and make-up for assembly programs.
5. Hold dress rehearsals for all programs which would obviously require them.
6. See that assembly programs are publicized in the *local* papers, and that townspeople are invited to attend.
7. Have the *conclusion* of the program *planned*, so that the audience knows when the program is over.
8. A member of the assembly committee, preferably a student, should be delegated to meet outside performers and to acquaint them with the facilities of the school. They should be shown the stage, and, time permitting, should have an opportunity for a rehearsal on the stage.

C. *The Performance*

1. All assemblies should begin on time.
2. The curtain should be opened far enough so all can see.
3. Programs should be run off quickly with no delay between numbers.
4. If a P. A. system is used, check the microphone and the volume in advance.
5. Do not permit students who have appeared in an early number on the program to go out into the audience for the last of the assembly. All performers should have an opportunity to see the other numbers during rehearsal, and should remain backstage for the entire assembly period.
6. Plan for distribution and collection of material used by the audience, such as song sheets.
7. Visiting students who present programs usually are interested in seeing the building; the assembly committee should arrange for a conducted tour.

IV

Kinds of Programs

A. *Programs by Oustide Groups*

1. Alumni program. (This is a good one for an opener after the preliminary seating assembly suggested earlier in the article. Alumni are usually available at this time as public schools generally open before colleges. Later in the year, it is difficult to get them.)
2. Outside speakers. (Students will respond well to speakers if they know *how* to talk to high school students and avoid *talking down* to the audience. Careful check should be made on the ability of the speaker. If possible, someone on the assembly committee should hear the speaker before deciding to invite him to speak to the students. The committee should inform the speaker as to the time he is to take, and give him some suggestions for a subject.)
3. Programs by college groups. (Since Boulder is the location of the state university, it was possible to have some excellent programs provided by university groups. An occasional program of this nature serves as an excellent example for high-school students. Various colleges send groups out to high schools during the year. A letter to college speech and music departments might open this possibility to you.)
4. A program by a neighboring school, i.e., the exchange assembly.

B. *Programs Which Might Be Presented by School Organizations*

1. Hidden talent show. (Another program which is good for early in the year. At Boulder High this one was sponsored by the staff of the school paper.)
2. Faculty program. (The faculty of Boulder High presented in assembly a take-off on a popular musical comedy. Students like to see faculty members take their hair down and show that they are human.)
3. Class programs. (Each of the three or four classes of the high school assumes responsibility for working up an assembly. Competition usually leads to good programs.)
4. Programs by school clubs. (The Boulder High Spanish Club presented an excellent South American program, given in Spanish and costumed in the native dress. It was from this program that the tango number was found for the exchange assembly. Other clubs which might contribute programs are the Hi-Y, Girl Reserve, Girls Athletic Association, Boys Athletic Club, Dramatics, Speech, Student Council, Photography, Art, Future Farmers of America, the school paper staff, yearbook staff, International Relations, French, Science, and Pep Clubs.)
5. A debate. (Certainly there is a place on the schedule for a debate between the school's best team and a strong rival team. Students are usually most attentive if the debaters are experienced.)

C. *Programs Which Might Originate in School Classes*

1. Forums or panel discussions on school problems.
2. Gym exhibit.
3. Programs growing out of class work. (The physics class once gave an assembly in which students explained and demonstrated projects. Various other departments have possible assembly programs growing out of class work.)
4. A fashion show or parade. (In one assembly the girls from the home economics class modeled dresses they had made. Or again, costumes from different periods could be modeled. Skits might be written on the theme of courtship in grandma's day, mama's day, and daughter's day.)
5. Finals in girls and boys basketball from the intramural program.
6. Parliamentary practice. (We once had a program presented by the speech class in which the members of the class were inmates of an old folks' home holding a meeting. The original script together with the costuming and staging made this an interesting as well as an informative program.)
7. Declamations, orations, and choral speaking. (Another program which could be presented by a speech class or club.)

D. *Music, Dance, and Drama Programs*

1. Group singing. (A very successful program of this type was patterned after one of the radio programs by having an extension cord on the microphone, so that the master of ceremonies could wander up the aisles in order to have various students and faculty members sing solo on parts of the songs. Group singing is best used as a part of a program, not taking more than 10 or 15 minutes at the most.)
2. Band and orchestra concerts. (Again, it is advisable to seek *variety* instead of having a full program of band or orchestra music. Solo numbers might be brought in, or possibly a demonstration by the drum majorettes.)
3. A capella choir, or boys and girls glee club programs. (As with band and orchestra assemblies, it is well to bring in solos, duets, trios, triple trios, etc.)
4. The one-act play. (Always popular.)
5. Hidden talent show.

6. A dance program. (Many possibilities in this. Might be an interpretative dance program, or it could be built around the development of the dance taking in various periods and ending with a fast jitter-bug number. Again, the Boulder High students enjoyed seeing several faculty couples stage a square dance.)

E. *Miscellaneous Programs*

1. Motion pictures.
2. Quiz programs with audience participation.
3. Programs developed around themes such as fire prevention, safety, citizenship, health, vocations, education, travel, equal rights, United Nations, etc.
4. Programs developed around important seasons or occasions such as the Christmas and Easter program, birthdays of Presidents, patriotic holidays, etc. Such programs can be treated in countless ways—student talks, tabloids, dramatizations, panels, music, among others.
5. Radio program. (The audience looks in on a broadcast. Fun can be had not only within the program itself, but through the antics of the sound effects man.)
6. A mock political convention. (Can be very successful during a national election year. Also, might be staged around a school election.)
7. Recognition assemblies. (These should be run off quickly, asking the audience to hold applause until all of a given group have been presented. Speeches should be *short*.)
8. Community service program. (Ways in which students can be of help in the community, and opportunities open to students.)

THE FORUM

TOWARD THE HISTORY OF SPEECH EDUCATION

Most teachers of speech take a reasonable satisfaction in the progress and present status of our profession; at the same time, we recognize that much remains to be done before we have reached the saturation point. It is doubtful, however, if so many of us are aware of the long, difficult road that the teaching of speech had to pass over before it reached its present position in the curriculum. We know, in general, that the history of our discipline goes back to classical antiquity; we are faintly conscious of the fact that that history has been unbroken for almost twenty-five centuries, and in our own country for more than three hundred years. The account of where we came from and how we got to the position we now hold, even in so far as it has already been set down, is an interesting one, and well worth some examination. It should be still more interesting as additional details are revealed.

In the belief that such a story would be worth while from many points of view, the Executive Council in 1944 established the Committee on the History of Speech Education, whose specific assignment is to encourage research and publication in that particular field, in order that the account may be made more complete, and that through publication it may also be made available to speech teachers and to the educational world in general. Present members of the Committee are John Dolman, Jr., Bert Emsley, Wilbur E. Gilman, Mary Margaret Robb, Lester Thonssen, Russell H. Wagner, with the writer as Chairman.

Although the scope of the Committee's activities is ultimately to include the entire range of the history of speech education, its present efforts are concentrated on the development of speech education in America; within the limits of our own country is enough material to occupy our attention for some time to come.

Three specific projects were agreed upon by the Committee at the Chicago Convention, in the furtherance of its objectives. The first one is the publication of a volume of studies in the backgrounds of American speech education. This volume, which is not intended as a detailed or continuous history, is to include instead a series of papers which will present the major influences and movements that have contributed most significantly to the development of speech education in America. It is hoped that these studies can be published in a single volume, and at such a price as will be attractive to most teachers of speech. For these studies an editor is to be chosen, to have general direction of the work. Second, a volume of source material is to be assembled, to include in facsimile whenever feasible, as much as possible of the original material from which our present theory and practice have been derived. Third, it is the ultimate intention to compile a definitive *history* of speech education, which will trace in a more continuous pattern the development of speech education in America from its beginnings. It is anticipated that this history is a long-time un-

dertaking which will have to await, for its completion, considerably further research in specific areas.

These three projects are not, however, the only things with which the Committee is concerned. We feel that, although there has already been a significant amount of exploring, there is still a vast field open for investigation through theses, dissertations, and independent studies, which may cover local, regional, or general areas. We should like to take this opportunity of encouraging the continuation, and even the expanding of such researches, and their publication in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL and the *Monographs*. We are especially interested in knowing of particularly good source material that will be of significance in the tracing of the important movements and influences in the development of American speech education. Perhaps of greatest immediate importance in the present work of the Committee will be information relative to possible contributors and directors of studies within the framework of the projects as a whole. Finally, the Committee will welcome the opportunity of serving as a sort of clearing-house for information on studies under way, in order, first, that duplication of effort may be avoided, and second, that we may have a more complete picture of what is actually being done in this particular field.

Judging from the expressed opinion of a large number of the members of the ASSOCIATION, this program is "important and timely." It cannot be completed by the Chairman of the Committee, nor by the Committee as a whole. It will require the contributions of a large number of interested persons. We should like to solicit the cooperation, the contributions, the assistance of every member of the ASSOCIATION who may have an interest in furthering an understanding of the backgrounds of American speech education.

GILES WILKESON GRAY, CHAIRMAN,
Committee on the History of Speech Education

GOOD WISHES

In this, its last number, the present editorial staff of the JOURNAL extends its best wishes to the new editor, Harold F. Harding, and his editorial board. We are sure that under Mr. Harding's leadership the JOURNAL will prosper.

For the past three years, the JOURNAL not entirely escaping the disastrous blows that the war dealt to scholarship and creative effort in the humanities and social studies, has endeavored to merit the respect and confidence of ASSOCIATION readers. Insofar as it has been successful, the credit must go to the Associate Editors whose labor has often been herculean. To them I wish here to express my gratitude and that of ASSOCIATION members everywhere.

—K.R.W.

CORRECTION

Russell H. Wagner points out that his letter to the Editor in the October, 1947, issue of this JOURNAL was in error. At least three copies of Wilson's *Rhetorique*, 1553 edition, are known to be in the United States, besides the one recently secured by Cornell University. His letter should have been confined to the announcement that Cornell had purchased this edition. Such an announcement would seem justified, since copies of this printing have not been known to be available to scholars in other American university libraries.

NEW BOOKS

HOWARD GILKINSON, *Editor*

Speech Communication: A Brief Textbook. By WILLIAM NORWOOD BRIGANCE. New York: F. S. Crofts, 1947; pp. 220. $1.75.

"The tendency is toward longer and longer textbooks in speech. What some of us want is a short textbook that makes no pretense of covering the whole field of speech, but that instead selects the essential aspects most needed by students in the shorter courses and treats them adequately."

Professor Brigance quotes this statement from a teacher, and then indicates that *Speech Communication* is a "*brief* textbook adapted to short regular college classes, to evening and extension courses, and to Communications courses where instruction in speech and writing is combined here into one class."

Any brief textbook in speech which attempts to "select the essential aspects most needed by students . . . and treat them adequately" faces an extremely difficult problem. The problem of what students most need in speech training is one never-ending discussion among teachers. An accurate, objective answer to this question still awaits good scientific research. Readers of this book will discover that the selection of material in *Speech Communication* is especially well adapted and well chosen to meet the needs of the students it aims to serve. The selection is pertinent, practical; and it has the virtue of appealing both to the student and the teacher.

The ten chapters, covering 162 pages, are Respecting the Rights of Listeners, Developing the Mental Attitude for Good Speaking, Being Seen, Heard, and Understood, Organizing the Speech into Concise and Orderly Form, Acquiring Ease and Fluency, Using Words and Ideas, Handling Demonstration Equipment and Visual Aids, Carrying on Group Discussion, Broadcasting a Speech, The Postscript. Then there is an appendix of six well-selected specimen speeches that covers 53 pages, and an index of four pages.

An even greater difficulty confronts the writer of a brief textbook in speech when he attempts to treat the selected material adequately. One of the major problems that the teacher of the shorter course in public speaking, and to a certain extent, the teacher of a course in communication, must face is that class periods must be devoted primarily to student practice in speaking (and writing). The textbook must, therefore, be assigned as additional information, elaboration, and clarification. The book for such courses must be so arranged and developed that the student can find the additional information and elaboration in such form as to be readily available and easily understood by him. The textbook must be more than a "handbook," and yet it must have the conveniences of a handbook. *Speech Communication* has a very satisfactory index of four pages that the student may consult. It is my opinion, after ten years of teaching the shorter public speaking course and two years of the communications course, that the material given is more than "adequate" in its development. Its clarity appears to be such that the student may easily comprehend it. The style is direct, succinct, and concise.

Features that seem worthy of special attention are the intelligent statement on "delivery"; the superior treatment, in so short a space, of organization and outlining; the nine pages of photographs showing speakers alert and communicating rather than assuming beautiful poses; the helpful exercises at the ends of most chapters; and the exemplary specimen speeches.

Speech Communication succeeds admirably in meeting the needs of those who desire a shorter book for the short course in public speaking and for some of the courses called communications. It is a valuable addition to the publications that stress practical public speaking for the first, and possibly the only, speech course.

CLYDE W. DOW,
Michigan State College

Basic Training in Speech. By LESTER THONSSEN and HOWARD GILKINSON. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1947; pp. viii+551. $3.25.

Hollywood would call this work a colossal venture, academes an ambitious undertaking. Certainly ambition could be made of no sterner stuff than is evinced in the efforts of Thonssen and Gilkinson to write a textbook covering the field of speaking in its diverse forms. The plan is ambitious both in its extensity and intensity. Many writers have treated the subject of speech extensively including, in a single volume, con-

versation, public speech, oral interpretation, debate, and parliamentary procedure. Few have attempted to cover at the same time and within a single volume an intensive and exhaustive treatment of materials relating to each form of speech. The authors have carried to completion such an elaborate plan. How well they have succeeded, the student and not the teacher will finally decide.

The intensive research-approach to materials in a book designed for beginners in a college or university course in speech is an innovation. It is clear that the authors believe that the student should be as familiar with the *evolution* of the theories and principles as with the application of these principles. They report by historical resume or by tables, graphs, and discussion the researches leading to the establishment of these principles. Results of experiments to determine the degree of distortion of the voice in recording, the relative effectiveness of various types of emphasis, the effects of variety of vocal response—all reported in tabular form—are typical examples. The result is a book that is scholarly, impressive, complete—but somewhat ponderous. Will the beginning student in speech also be impressed and enlightened? The trustworthy answer should come and will come from such a student after a year's study with this book as his companion piece. I would surmise that beginning students will find it difficult to interpret the significance of the tables and reports and might find the reading more stimulating and profitable if the authors had subordinated the research and had made it incidental to the discussion. They will feel, I fear, that the inclusion of these materials weighs heavily upon a style that is, at the outset, formal and impersonal.

There are distinctive contributions in this book which may outweigh first impressions of style and organization. Every teacher recognizes the increasing paucity in vocabulary of college freshmen, and especially in oral vocabulary, yet few of us have devised a constructive program to fill this appalling gap in liberal education. To my knowledge, no textbook in the fundamentals of speech includes a more extensive and practical treatment of vocabulary, articulation, and pronunciation. By basic discussion, exercises, and tests, the authors have outlined an excellent plan of education and reeducation.

One will find, too, few books in this field which give as much help to the beginning student as the chapters in this book relating to social adjustment, stage fright, and the personal resources of the speaker. The number of practical suggestions to the student is evidence of the experience of the authors in dealing with neophytes in speech.

The student will enjoy the illustrative literary materials because they are close to his interests. The literature of other centuries is well represented but the emphasis is upon our contemporaries: Eric Johnston, Wendell Willkie, Edward Murrow, Norman Corwin, Thomas Wolfe, Kenneth Roberts, and Van Wyck Brooks.

The emphasis "by place and by space" given to speech composition suggests that this is, in fact, a book on speaking with "extensions" into the fields of oral reading, debate, and radio speaking. Undoubtedly the "extensions" were included because it is the current practice to cover these materials in introductory courses. The sections on speech composition and delivery are a distinct contribution.

Minor questions might be raised on nomenclature and arrangement. Basic Habits does not seem to be the exact title for Part III which includes chapters on the Sounds of English Speech and The Phonetic Alphabet. Similarly, the title for Part V, Adaptations to Special Occasions, is misleading. Oral Reading, included in this division, is an adaptation to what "special occasion?" Part VI, dealing with the psychology of speech, might logically be incorporated in Part II, Foundations of Speech, since much of the material is a foundation stone of effective speech.

These questions, however, are not decisive in the final assessment. The crucial question is, "Is there too much about too many subjects?" I would answer, albeit with reservation, in the affirmative.

MILDRED FREBURG BERRY,
Rockford College

Basic Principles of Speech. Revised Edition. By LEW SARETT and WILLIAM TRUFANT FOSTER. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1946; pp. 592. $3.25.

When there appears a revision of a book as well known as *Basic Principles of Speech*, naturally keen interest is aroused. In my opinion the revision is an improvement over the original and reflects credit on the authors and our profession.

In external appearance it is a new book, the warm color of which arrests interest. While the size of type is the same, because of increased spacing between words, it should be easier for the average student to read. The paper is almost too thin as it allows the print to show through.

and it is so slick that light is too readily reflected. The prose and poetry selections in the Exercises stand out better and are much easier to read. Through the use of different type the topic headings are made more arresting. Though there are more pages, the book is thinner than the original.

The old division, Part One: Delivery, and Part Two: Composition, is the same, though the word Speech has been inserted before composition. In Chapter 2, the basic principles have become seven with the addition of "An Effective Speaker Uses the Techniques of Speech in Order to Bring Attention to a High Peak on the Response He Seeks." The chapter on suggestion now appears in Part Two where it rightfully belongs. Whereas in the previous edition, Methods of Arranging Ideas was a part of Chapter 15, in the revision a new chapter has been added using that title. It is a far better treatment of the topic and makes the book more valuable. Chapter 17, The Body: Exposition, Description, Narration, is an addition which fills an obvious gap in the former edition. In the above chapter the authors in discussing the topic of visual aids might well have given more specific instruction in the preparation and use of these aids. Here is a phase of instruction that has made great strides in recent years and is deserving of better treatment. In Chapter 19, The Body: Persuasion, the four "Basic Desires" have become six; the two added are *"Desire to Maintain the Status Quo,"* and *"Desire for Change."* These seemingly paradoxical statements are easily and rightfully reconciled in the textual explanation. Another real improvement in this chapter is the organization, enumeration, and discussion of methods of holding attention. The authors are to be commended for their attempt to keep pace with the findings, more or less scientific, in the field of the social sciences.

The plates used for illustrative purposes are excellent; they give the book "punch," liven up the text, but above all are first-rate illustrations of the principles discussed. It is to be regretted that they did not include from the previous edition one or two of the pictures that were splendid examples of how a principle was not being followed; a negative illustration is often as good a teaching device as a positive one. Moreover, the plates might better have been placed close to the text they illuminate. Possibly the authors or publishers have some good practical reason for not so doing.

Like its predecessor, this edition is dual in purpose and as such is adaptable to what the teacher of a beginning course thinks should be the approach and the emphasis. In a footnote at the end of Chapter 1, page 12, the authors say, "Thus anyone who wishes to study the fundamentals of delivery through extemporaneous speeches finds suitable assignments; and anyone who prefers to approach the fundamentals through interpretation and declamation finds exercises that lend themselves to this approach"; and "The instructor whose approach to the fundamentals of speech is largely or solely extemporaneous may follow either of two general procedures." I emphasize this because it shows what is a characteristic of the authorship which runs through the book like the main current of a stream, a recognition that there is no one and only *right* way to approach the beginning speech course, no *single* method to attain the objectives, no *best* set of exercises and selections.

The joint authors of *Basic Principles of Speech* have done a good job of revising what is generally recognized as a good textbook. They have brought the book up to date with their use of persons, places, and events of the contemporary scene. The exercise material is varied and well chosen; the speech topics are stimulating and thought provoking. The book is adaptable, readable, and teachable.

H. P. CONSTANS,
University of Florida

Notebook for Public Speaking: A College Course in Basic Principles. By RAY EHRENSBERGER and ELAINE PAGEL. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946; pp. x+166.

This volume supplies a number of needs for the college student of the basic public speaking course. It provides speech assignments of careful detail, together with outline blanks to be filled in by the student prior to each speech. There are, too, blanks on which the teacher may record his criticism, with two "Master Criticism Charts" (one for each semester) on which the speaker may enter his speech-to-speech progress.

An unusual feature of this book is that it does not attempt to provide all the necessary material itself; instead, the student is given a particular assignment and permitted to choose his reading from among nine speech books. Exact page references to these volumes are given. Question sheets follow each reading assignment and thus afford the instructor an easy check on the student's reading among the references.

A most desirable feature is the opportunity given the student to report on outside speeches, with detailed queries for each of the assignments. Valuable also are the sections devoted to correct pronunciation and to increasing the vocabulary.

This volume, then, may be used as the only textbook in a college course, in which event all or some of the nine volumes here virtually indexed would be needed on the library reserve list, or this may be employed as a companion book to any one of the nine. Either way, the instructor and student alike will find the book useful.

THEODORE G. EHRSAM,
New York University

Four Who Spoke Out. By ROBERT T. OLIVER. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1946; pp. x+196. $2.50.

American students of public address and of public affairs will do well to know more about British Parliamentary speaking, past and present. This volume contributes to that understanding. The book deals with Burke, Fox, Sheridan, and Pitt the Younger and attempts to "assess the means by which the four greatest speakers of that time exercised their influence over the British Parliament and nation—and thereby upon the world." As the title might imply, the study attempts to simplify and popularize academic information and research already available. High school and college students, relatively unfamiliar with these outstanding Parliamentary debaters, will here find brief, lively, and discerning descriptions of each and inspiration to study them.

Part One (Chapters 1 and 2) summarizes their place in history and their England of 1775-1806. They were "prize spokesmen of a new order." Their England was a land of unstable parliamentary governments; of naval press gangs and mutinies; of cruel criminal laws; of terrible prison conditions; of slave mine labor; of duelling; but of slowly emerging democratic reforms, of recognition of the common man and of humanitarianism.

Part Two (Chapters 3-6) diagnoses the audience, the corrupt parliament, the complacent king, the restless people.

Part Three (Chapters 7-10) analyzes the character and personality of each of these speakers: Burke, "genius on fire," Fox, "disheveled advocate," Sheridan, "player off stage," and Pitt the Younger, "genius on ice."

Part Four (Chapters 11-14) interprets and evaluates the persuasive techniques of each. Burke is "the artist"; Fox, "the debater"; Sheridan, "the wit"; and Pitt, "the artisan."

Part Five (Chapter 15) is a summary. Appendix A is a "Biographical Table"; Appendix B, a "Bibliographical Note."

The writer's point of view throughout is that of the student of rhetoric and of public speaking. In the interest of simplicity, Professor Oliver may have sacrificed something of accurate diagnosis and discrimination. The categories into which these four speakers are pigeonholed are almost too neat. Sheridan, for example, was a "wit," but he was much else. As Oliver himself concludes, "he was a jester who could be terribly earnest at times. But for his readers now, as for his auditors then, it is sometimes difficult to tell in which character he appeared." Chauncy Goodrich, whose *Select British Eloquence* still provides penetrating criticism of these four speakers, would have less tendency to label cavalierly the complex public speaking qualities of each.

Because Oliver is especially well qualified to lay bare the elements involved in the psychology of persuasive public address, we wish that he had treated with fullness any one of these four speakers; or, better still, one period in the career of one of them.

Although historians and biographers, including Lecky, Traill, Sir Leslie Stephen, the two Trevelyans, Rose, Samuels, Murray Morley, Magnus, Cobban, Hobhouse, Lascelles (these four last mentioned are ignored in Oliver's study and bibliography), and research students have already contributed significant theses and papers on phases of these oratorical careers, many problems and much material are yet unexploited. Productive scholarship will be best served, however, if the area of any single investigation is carefully restricted.

A. CRAIG BAIRD,
University of Iowa

Mass Persuasion: The Psychology of a War Bond Drive. By ROBERT E. MERTON, assisted by MARJORIE FISKE and ALBERTA CURTIS. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946; pp. 210. $2.50.

This addition to the publications of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, under the general editorial supervision of Paul F. Lazarsfeld, is a study in the methods and effects of propaganda, using as its case study the 65 separate appeals made by Kate Smith for the purchase of war bonds over CBS on September 21, 1943, during a span of 18 hours, resulting in telephone pledges during the day for $39,000,000 worth of bonds.

The authors summarize six advantages of this event for "a study in social psychology": (1) it was a "real life" situation; (2) bond purchases provided a crude index of the effectiveness of the persuasion; (3) the situation was "emotion-

ally freighted"; (4) "objective aspects of the situation" (*i.e.*, "precisely what happened in the broadcast") could be readily defined; (5) persons whose responses were studied came from different social groups, not from college classrooms; and (6) the event occurred within the framework of a well-defined cultural context, *i.e.*, the war.

Methodology of the study included three-to four-hour focused interviews with 75 bond pledgers and 25 who heard the broadcasts but did not make pledges, all living in New York City. Key questions helpful in testing their general conclusions were asked of a supplementary list of 978 persons, carefully selected to provide a cross section of Greater New York's population. The third aspect of the study consisted of a content analysis of Kate Smith's broadcasts.

The gross result was the pledge to buy $39,000,000 worth of bonds. Of the 75 persons intensively interviewed, 43 had had a definite intention to purchase a bond before hearing Miss Smith; 31 had not. Of the total number interviewed, only one "expressed a hostile attitude toward war bonds" a significant measure of unusual unanimity in the general social context.

This book is of interest for its illustration of difficult research methodology, for its analysis of the persuasive effectiveness of Kate Smith and her script writers, for its analysis of the radio audience, for its testimony to the cumulative effects of continued persuasion. For all of these reasons it should be read thoughtfully by all who are interested in the processes of persuasion.

The book has an additional interest to all who are concerned with the mores and attitudes of American life. It is highly significant, for instance, that the overwhelming testimony of the listeners was to Kate Smith's *sincerity*, and even more significant that a great many considered her almost unique in this respect among people in public life. There was apparent among the interviewees a great hunger for an integrity they were not accustomed to find. "Society is experienced as an arena for rival frauds," as the authors put it. Interviewees generally expressed a distrust of politicians and an impatience with the "glamour pattern" of typical entertainers. Smith was regarded highly because she seemed to be "just folks." Perhaps there is a valuable cue here for the over-slick advertising agencies and publicists. In view of the corps of script-writers who labored with very conscious artfulness to produce the Smith copy, there also inheres in this reaction a rather sad commentary upon the discernment of the radio audience.

The authors found that many motives for buying bonds were interwoven. "For some, it is at once an expression of patriotic sentiments; a testimonial to a deep-lying attachment to a parent-like figure; a quasi-magical procedure for protecting sons or brothers exposed to danger; a symbol of participation in a significant joint endeavor with an indefinitely large number of like-minded members of one's in-group; a device for allaying a cumulative sense of guilt."

Readers of this study who are predisposed to believe that decisions are ordinarily little influenced by facts or logic will find here support for that judgment. Finally, those who are not admirers of Kate Smith may have reason to feel uneasy as they read her own reaction to the thrilling day of multi-million sales: "I'm just fascinated by the power of speech. That day of bond selling proved it to me." The dead-pan authors coupled this statement from Miss Smith with an apparently unrelated quotation from Lewis Mumford: "The possibilities for good and evil here are immense."

ROBERT T. OLIVER,
Washington, D. C.

Handbook for Discussion Leaders. By J. JEFFERY AUER and HENRY LEE EWBANK. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947; pp. 118. $1.75.

This book fills a definite need in the field of public discussion. It is a simple, clear, concise, and common sense treatment of the minimum essentials for leading a group discussion. It provides help for the inexperienced discussion leader similar to that which handbooks on parliamentary procedure give to those inexperienced in presiding over business meetings.

This handbook does not provide the general treatment of discussion found in some books on the subject. It is not intended to do so. It confines its treatment to the responsibilities and duties of discussion leaders and does not deal with the role of the participants.

Help is given in "analyzing the group, choosing the topic for discussion, selecting the participants, arranging mechanical details, and creating interest and publicizing the matter." The authors have their own classification of the "forms of discussion." It seems that the literature in the field of discussion lacks a common nomenclature for referring to distinguishable kinds of discussion: informal group discussion, round table discussion, panel discussion, symposium, etc.

The authors deal with the role of the leader in a variety of tasks: "the leader in a group discussion, the committee chairman, the leader in a panel discussion, the leader in a symposium, the leader in a debate, and the leader in a forum period." It seems to me that the role of the leader might be better explained if at least one chapter had been given to a description of the responsibilities of the participants. Sometimes, especially in informal group discussion, the leader finds himself a co-participant who must assume responsibilities for contributing as well as directing. The book does not emphasize this as much as it might. The authors might defend this omission on the grounds that they do not wish to encourage over-participation by the leader. Perhaps a straight forward treatment of the extent to which the leader should be a contributor would be a helpful addition.

Despite the compact nature of the book the authors have succeeded in including some explicit instructions on preparing for various types of meetings. Since the ultimate attainment in any public discussion is likely to be in direct proportion to the adequacy of preparation, the suggestions in these sections are valuable. For instance, the authors provide a guide for the preparation of a general discussion outline together with a sample illustrating its application to a specific subject. The "stock" general discussion outline which is suggested follows the thought processes as set forth by John Dewey for an orderly step-by-step investigation of the problem, evaluation of solutions, and formulation of a decision.

The book closes with a brief section on "What have you accomplished?", designed to aid the discussion leader in the evaluation of discussion. The material in this section should enable the leader to evaluate his own work and to improve with experience.

The book represents a distinctive contribution to the literature on public discussion and should be especially helpful to the inexperienced discussion leader.

LEROY T. LAASE,
University of Nebraska

The Church Across the Street. By REGINALD D. MANWELL and SOPHIA LYON FAHS. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1946; pp. 272. $2.50.

A Guide for Teachers Using The Church Across The Street. By SOPHIA LYON FAHS and REGINALD D. MANWELL. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1946; pp. 21. 50c.

This book merits scrutiny by teachers of discussion for two reasons: it evolved out of a discussion project, and it provides a serviceable design for a series of rewarding discussions.

One of its authors—a professor of zoology, incidentally—while teaching a Sunday-School class of high-school youths several years ago, built a unit of study of religious beliefs held by denominations other than his own, of "churches across the street." This book is a product of his research and his direction of the resultant discussions. It offers a sharply-etched introduction to the basic tenets, and some of the more definite customs, of thirteen different faiths. Its method is a winning one; the approach in each instance is through a compact historical sketch of the life and work of some person in the denomination. After a chapter devoted to "The Beginning"—which in 13 pages highlight a number of important events between the time of Jesus and the 16th century "protest"—thirteen chapters follow, averaging less than 20 pages apiece: Martin Luther and the Lutherans, John Calvin and the Presbyterians, Michael Servetus and the Unitarians, Ignatius Loyola and the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches, Thomas Cranmer and the Episcopalians, Robert Browne and the Congregationalists, John Runyan and the Baptists, George Fox and the Friends, John Wesley and the Methodists, Hosea Ballou and the Universalists, Joseph Smith and the Mormons, Mary Baker Eddy and the Church of Christ Scientist, finally the "Mother of All Churches," Judaism. The authors regret all omissions: "The Disciples, for instance, who number nearly two millions in the United States, and a number of other very interesting groups [are] passed by with great reluctance"; "three rather small denominations —the Friends, the Unitarians and the Universalists" are included because "their significance far outweighs their numbers."

Obviously here is a practical source book for a series of small-group or of forum discussions of "other" faiths, suitable not only for church schools and youth groups, but also for heterogeneous college classes in religious philosophy or in discussion, where contributions by members of sundry faiths can enhance the utility of the book. The authors' treatment of "rival" faiths—they are liberal Unitarians—strikes me as eminently just: few, I suspect, will judge that their own denominations have been unfairly dealt with. Moreover, even if there is evidence of such bias as inevitably accrues from inclusion and exclusion, from emphasis and proportion, the discussion process happily contains its own means of amendment.

The publisher is to be commended for a

most attractive format. Unfortunately, footnotes are few and bibliography sparse. Coupled with the sketchiness of the exposition of each faith, this may be a limitation. Those who seek, however—by inquiry at local churches or at national offices of the various denominations—will surely find a plethora of materials to round out preparation for informal, purposeful talk. The arrangement of chapters on a chronological rather than a logical basis is no handicap; since each chapter is an entity, the sequence can be adapted to the needs of individual groups.

The accompanying "Guide for Teachers" is one of the best such pamphlets I have recently seen—one of the best because it is one of the most specific. There are no general platitudes about discussion theory. Wisely assuming that the guide will often be used by tyros in leadership, it designates specific, concrete methods for enlivening a series of meetings devoted to this particular book: a tentative schedule; use of charts and maps; use of dramatic dialogues, what to do before, while, and after visiting other churches; special topics for individual study; how to discuss rather than argue about personal beliefs; thought-provoking sample quiz sheets, etc. Even experienced discussion leaders will glean from this guide stimulating suggestions.

J. Calvin Callaghan,
Syracuse University

Oral Reading. By Lionel Crocker and Louis M. Eich. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1947; pp. 507. $4.25.

The need for less "fuss and feathers" and more practical training in oral reading has been voiced by many teachers and students. The radio has done much to make us conscious of the inadequate training of many people who attempt to communicate the ideas of the printed page to an audience. The good reader is expected to read well a variety of material ranging from that which is purely informational to that which has a highly emotional content. For this reason, courses in oral interpretation often include in addition to the tried and sometimes trite material used in the past, some that is contemporaneous, such as editorials, book reviews, magazine articles and stories. The authors of *Oral Reading* have designed their book with these current needs in mind.

Approximately two-thirds of the book is an anthology which shows a very catholic taste in selection. A small sampling of the authors represented will illustrate the point: Francis Bacon, Peter Bowman (*Beach Red*), Thomas Hardy, Samuel Hoffenstein, John Steinbeck, Ernie Pyle, and Raymond Gram Swing. There are included excerpts from Lloyd Douglas' *The Robe*, Browning's *My Last Duchess*, the Biblical story of *The Prodigal Son*, and from six Shakespearian plays. The content is varied and usable and will be appreciated by both teachers and students.

Catholicity is also evident in the discussion of *Principles*, and a few times seems to lead the authors into positions not easily defensible. The definition of oral reading is stretched to include all the distant relatives: "Spoken reading, in summary, is an enormous province, extending all the way from (and overlapping somewhat) extempore speaking, with many and variegated gradations, up to (and partially including) the realm of acting."

Teachers and textbook writers in recent years have thought it necessary to draw the frame of reference more clearly, making a distinction between *oral reading* and acting and impersonation. The contest has been deplored in which the contestant, instead of giving a straightforward reading, has attempted to impersonate kings, beggars, and galloping horses with ludicrous results. The old-fashioned memorized reading is no longer in great demand as a form of entertainment. It is, therefore, disconcerting to find that the first illustration is a picture of Cornelia Otis Skinner as *Anne Boleyn* and another of Ruth Draper. These women are fine artists and their performances really one-woman plays, but few students are interested in or capable of this kind of specialized training.

To illustrate further the difficulties that arise from too liberal a point of view, the discussion of taste in selection of material may be cited. Although the authors state in the preface that they believe the book will help the student to form a "sound standard of literary criticism," the section on this subject gives little specific help to the student. William Lyon Phelps is offered as a model of a man of wide taste because, although he taught Tennyson and Browning, he counted Edgar A. Guest and Gene Tunney among his friends. The discussion ends: "Perhaps if we define *improving* one's taste to mean *widening* one's taste, we set up a standard worthier of attainment. On college campuses it is often 'smart' to laugh at Longfellow and to despise Kipling. But the reader with catholicity of taste will not shut the door on any writer who has honestly and sincerely tried to set forth human experience." If *trying* is the criterion the student has little to guide him.

Throughout the book there are references to and excerpts from current magazines. The inclusion of *Reader's Digest*, *Colliers*, *Liberty*,

and *Everywoman's* will be protested by some teachers. Some of the excerpts may well be questioned, not so much because of their source, but because they have not been carefully selected as illustrative material. To illustrate the discussion of an agreeable voice for radio, an excerpt from the *Reader's Digest* article on Raymond Gram Swing is given. The story is told of his being placed upon the road to success by a clergyman who told him to whisper ten minutes every day. "Swing whispered hoarsely and industriously every day for weeks. He made recordings of his voice, and for hours his long, lanky form was stooped over a phonograph, his features gaunt and somber as he studied the inflections of the voice that was to bring him fame." Many people would not credit him with an agreeable voice even now, and it is possible that his popularity is due to the content of his newscasts rather than to his voice. The suggestion of whispering every day is hardly one that should be an efficacious method for the would-be radio speaker to use in developing his voice, but no comment on the method is made.

In spite of certain weak spots which reflect the author's overly-generous and noncritical point of view, the book contains much that will be of help to the student. The material relating to the problem of *understanding* is particularly good. The discussion of the reading of narrative prose will undoubtedly prove helpful. Although the chapter discussing problems of technique includes some suggestions which are reminiscent of the old mechanical school, for the most part it is pertinent. Separate chapters are devoted to the public recital, choral reading, and radio reading. Teachers will find that this textbook contains material to stimulate lively discussion and a fine anthology of selections for practice in oral reading.

MARGARET ROBB,
University of Colorado

Are You Telling Them? By BESS SONDEL. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1947; pp. 292. $2.95.

One of the most useful tasks in the speech field is the writing of a book especially for the adult who is far from the classroom situation and who may not have an opportunity to take a speech course but who wants to improve his speaking. *Are You Telling Them?* is such a book. Its aim is to present a discussion of conversation and public speaking which is attractive, alive, and useful.

The book is not primarily a collection of speech rules or a handbook of techniques. The emphasis is not on details of speaking so much as it is on a philosophy of speech. Not that the presentation is abstract and impractical; numerous examples forestall this criticism. The important thing, however, is that the speaker see what he is doing as interaction and collaboration.

The theoretical background for this approach is derived from such writers as Charles Morris, Dewey, Mead, Kenneth Burke, and Ogden and Richards. With a background of philosophy, semantics, and practical teaching, Bess Sondel presents a concept of speech and makes it pertinent to interviews, conferences, and selling, as well as to less organized social intercourse. When any book presents a "new approach," as this one does, we may ask if it really is new. The author takes ideas and writings generally familiar to teachers of speech, culled from other fields, and applies them concretely to speech. In this sense particularly the approach is new.

It is worthwhile to review some of the points which are made to establish the author's position.

The importance of stability and flexibility to speech organization make careful analysis necessary. Stability is important as it pertains to idea and to structure—the controlling proposition and the parts of the outline. Because words are the speaker's agents, stability of terms is likewise required. Once a speaker understands what this stability means, then he is ready to consider the various uses of words. Uses are classified in Morris's terms as informative, valuative, incitive, and systemic—the latter referring to the organization used to effect the listener's responses and to crystallize them in terms of purpose.

The importance of process and change at work in the world cannot be overlooked. Any approach to speech which does so is not adequate. Thus, her discussion shows Bess Sondel as a gestaltist who predicates her suggestions upon a relativistic approach in which the individual is considered as a social self, as a "unique organism-as-a-whole-in-an-environment."

The problem of meaning is central because words are used for their communication value. But understanding is not the product of dictionary meanings, but of context. Even then it is always approximate, not complete. We must do our best in the face of these difficulties, we are told. As speakers, we should know what we are talking about and say what we mean insofar as possible. This means choosing words appropriate to our intended purpose. As listeners, we must define words in their context and dis-

tinguish as carefully as we can between the uses of language.

Our preparation for conversation is embodied in past experience—in our habits; but these habits are subject to modification. Interviews, salesmanship, conferences and courts of law all illustrate the use of purposive conversation. Conversation (and *all* speaking) to be worthwhile is dependent upon interpersonal collaboration rather than contest among members of a group.

Practical advice is given a secondary place in this book, but what is said offers genuine help to the speaker. He is cautioned to use vocal variety to express his ideas; he is advised of the importance of desk work—analysis preceding the speech; he is told to use no notes and not to memorize even the first and last sentences because these sentences must be adapted to the peculiar demands of the situation. He is reminded that spontaneous action comes naturally because your body will never fight your ideas.

The book is hardly suitable for use as a basic textbook—it is not broad enough in its coverage of speech situations. It concerns itself with informative and valuative uses rather than incitive uses of language, *i.e.*, persuasion. It will be exceptionally helpful, however, to the person who wants a modern viewpoint to use as the basis for his own speech development. It is ideal for anyone who is impatient with the rather factual, heavily literary speech text. The reader must provide himself with opportunities to practice the author's doctrine as he studies it to make the book of most use.

From a literary point of view, it seems that the style is typical of lectures—designed to be spoken, but at times too terse and choppy to be read with ease. On the other hand, informality and interest are gained by this means.

DON M. BRIELAND,
Grinnell College

Speech for the Classroom Teacher. Revised Edition. By DOROTHY I. MULGRAVE. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1946; pp. 423. $3.75.

The revised edition of *Speech for the Classroom Teacher* has an attractive format and an easily read type face. Only the first of the five sections retains its old title and those that were fourth and fifth have been reversed in order. The sections are entitled: I. The Problem; II. The Speech Mechanism; III. The Scientific Study of Language; IV. Speech Pathology; V. The Speech Arts. Chapters on Public Speaking and on Radio have been added to the Speech Arts section. The chapter on discussion has been improved by revision. The book now provides instructional material for all aspects of speech pertinent to the classroom teacher.

Some of the changes which have been made in the revision should be noted. Chapter I, Elements of the Teacher's Problem, has been improved by the addition of nearly three pages developing the section, Semantic Aspects. In Chapter II, Mechanism of Voice and Speech, a paragraph has been shifted from the middle of the chapter to the first page to direct attention to resonance as a factor in voice production. The descriptions of the structures used in speech are comprehensive and satisfactory. Chapter III, Training the Voice, is unchanged except for dropping exercise 4 for relaxing the jaw. The instruction and exercises in this chapter are good. Only the bibliography has been changed in Chapter V, Phonetic Approach To Language. This chapter, however, in its original form was adequate. One paragraph has been omitted from Chapter VI, Strong and Weak Forms. New practice sentences have improved Chapter VII, Analysis of English Vowels and Diphthongs. In the rewriting of Chapter VIII, Analysis of English Consonants, new practice material has been introduced, some words have been added to the pronunciation list, and some new selections in phonetic transcription have been added. No change has been made in the already adequate exercise material presented in Chapter IX. Although the discussion of remedial measures under speech pathology ignores ear training as an important therapeutic procedure, the discussion of this subject is adequate. Apparently no changes have been made in Oral Interpretation, Chapter XIV. Some new selections have been added to Chapter XV, Selections for Practice. Although Chapter XVI, Dramatics, seems unchanged, new items have been added to the bibliography. Students of speech should be attracted to the extensive bibliography which follows most of the chapters.

Certain sections of the book fall below the generally good quality of much of the book. Part of Chapter III, Training the Voice, is an example. A thesis in this chapter, "Quality is largely a matter of resonance, which in turn is primarily a matter of structural formation," would discourage many students about the possibility of voice improvement, and I believe the thesis is unsound. The information about voice production is very limited. The use of some terms should be criticised: the term *vocal cords* for the more accurately descriptive *vocal folds*, *energy* or *volume* for the simpler and more direct term *loudness*. Although the dia-

phragm is correctly placed in Chapter II, the student is instructed in Chapter II: "Place one hand on your diaphragm and feel the expansion that takes place." (Exercise No. 1, p. 38) Chapters V, VI, VII and VIII which deal with speech sounds, seem to be based on the assumption that there is only one acceptable American dialect of English—the Eastern American. The Southern American and the General American patterns of pronunciation are ignored completely. Nor has the author brought her system of phonetic symbols up to date as far as The American Pronouncing Dictionary is concerned. The symbol ordinarily used for "unstressed long a" [e] has been used for "short e" [ɛ]. Another confusing feature of the phonetic transcriptions, although it conforms to an earlier practice, is the use of the "upside down letter r" for the sound represented by that letter in the words "red", "very", "bright", etc.

Chapter XVIII, Public Speaking, could have been improved by the introduction of the use of the Central Idea. In the chapter on discussion, the list of discussion topics implies that the principal use of discussion is to provide information.

The second edition is an improvement over the first. The treatment of most of the topics is scholarly. The classroom teacher exposed to the material in this book would have a fairly satisfactory fund of information except for the items mentioned. The book, however, is suitable for use only in those localities in which the people are unaware of and indifferent to other patterns of pronunciation. All teachers should know that there are three acceptable patterns of pronunciation in use in the United States.

F. LINCOLN HOLMES,
Illinois State Normal University

American Speech. Revised edition. By WILHELMINA HEDDE and W. NORWOOD BRIGANCE. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1946; pp. xi+596. $1.96.

This revision of the 1942 edition of the book by the same title maintains the reputation of its predecessor as a thoroughly useful and interesting book for classes in secondary school speech. It is well written and appeals to adolescents; it is rich in content and combines exercise and reference materials which the high school teacher will appreciate because of their timeliness and practicability.

The textbook is based upon a philosophy of speech education which states that speech training is increasingly important "not merely for the talented few, but for all who in life must face speech situations in any form . . . so that they will be prepared for living the democratic way of life."

In revising the 1942 edition (reviewed in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL in February, 1943), the authors have retained the same general organization of the earlier work: Part I, Everyday Speech in a Democracy, Part II, Communicating Thought, Part III, Original Speaking, Part IV, Interpretation, Part V, Dramatics, with a concluding section which adds a Debate Society Constitution, Score Sheets, and a List of Important Days and Events, all of which are useful to a speech teacher in the secondary school.

They have added to Part I new material on the place of speech in a democracy, which gives to the student a realistic picture of the importance of speech, not only in our country, but also in the world scene. This same emphasis is carried into Chapter V, Parliamentary Procedure, in Part I. Here, in a section which relates this content to the United Nations Organization, they state, "even bad laws and undesirable conditions ought to be changed, not by force, but by discussion and persuasion operating through parliamentary practice." To Part II, Chapter IX, Listening, is a new addition. Although the treatment of this subject is brief, it contains a provocative opening on the importance of listening and includes some practical suggestions on "listening effectively." In Part III, the chapter on debate has been amplified in the illustrative content on analysis, briefing, and the list of propositions, to contain problems developed during the war and the post-war period. Here, again, the international slant colors these materials. In Part IV, Interpretation, there has been considerable enrichment of selections for reading. This is particularly true in Chapter XVI, Interpreting Types of Material. The literature of the past five years has been examined in order to secure attractive stimulating pieces for secondary school students.

Throughout the book, the reference materials have been increased and brought up to date. Exercises have also been adjusted to contemporary movements, information, and attitudes.

The book is extensive in treatment of the various areas of content which are often found in courses in the high school. A teacher's manual, which accompanies the text, suggests plans for courses from one to four semesters long.

In all, *American Speech*, 1946 edition, is a secondary school textbook of high quality which any teacher will find practical and time-saving

for herself, as well as interesting and sound for her students.

KARL F. ROBINSON,
Northwestern University

Manual of American Dialects: for Radio, Stage, Screen and Television. By LEWIS HELMAR HERMAN and MARGUERITE SHALETT HERMAN. Chicago: Ziff-Davis Publishing Company, 1947; pp. xvii+326. $6.00.

'The main purpose of this book is to teach the regional American dialects to actors. . . . This book is not a scientific study for the professional phonetician.' It would be inappropriate then to dwell on either excellencies or deficiencies in systematic treatment. Let us note with admiration an immense amount of apparently careful observation, much in most minute detail, and note with regret the tendency to treat dialects in terms of 'misuse' and 'error,' and get on to the important question: Does the book serve as efficient communication between authors and principal group of readers?

The set of phonetic symbols used seems to be even more awkward than other phonetic alphabets recently designed to achieve 'absence of diacritical markings, inverted letters, reversed signs, and foreign symbols.' The eminence of awkwardness is attained by superimposing upon the system a scheme of capitalizing vowel symbols 'with the exception of the "i" of "it" (it), and the "oo" of "good" (good),' and writing symbols for consonants 'in lower-case letters, with the exception of the voiced "TH" (th) of "THAT" (that).' But either "UH" or "uh" is used to indicate 'the General-American treatment of the mute or unstressed vowel sound.' The transcriptions are made more cumbersome by the use of double quotes, except in a few tables, and by the almost invariable addition of the spelling form in parentheses, regularly two parenthetical glosses when the idiom is not standard.

Some curious eye emphases result, where the physical stimulus of the capitalization runs counter to sometimes elaborate explanation of stress. Thus "UH" (a) often appears to the eye as the most prominent word in a sentence, and conspicuous "EE" serves for '"y" in a final, unstressed position.' The diphthongal form "iUH" of the Mountain dialect eye stresses the offglide, as does "uhEE" of New York City in spite of the explanation that "uh" receives the stress. There appears to be too much distinction made between variants "AHi" and "AWi-EE" of the New York City treatment of 'the vowel sound "I."' Inasmuch as the device of boldface type for indicating syllabic stress is rarely used, there is such eye suggestion of offstress as "bizEE" (busy) and dizuhEEdUH" (deserter). In sentences: '"daHz shishi tAWk." (That's *she-she* talk.) (That's *woman's* gossip.)' '"hEE shOH-ER UHz UH sli:UHk UHn" (He sure was a slick one).'

No wonder that the authors gave up the plan, followed in their earlier *Manual of Foreign Dialects*, of appending to each chapter an extended text in their phonetic transcript. Too much hard work for writer, printer, and proof reader, to say nothing of forbidding appearance for the reader. When will students of pronunciation get to realize that the one great virtue of such a phonetic alphabet as that of the IPA is its simplicity? It isn't magic, it isn't foreign, it isn't any more accurate or 'scientific' than a user makes it; it's just simple. To avoid the very slight effort of getting acquainted with the superficially strange symbols—an hour will do it—you have enormous waste of time, energy, paper, and ink, to say nothing of the friction of communication. The printers could have saved enough on time, paper, and ink for this one book to have got a font of IPA symbols and trained an operator to set them.

One more note on the communication. In no place are these awkward phonetic symbols defined except by key words. It is assumed that the key words are to be pronounced in 'what is commonly termed "General American" as it is spoken in the Middle West,' and that that pronunciation is to be taken as 'the basis of comparison.' Yet 'The Middle Western Dialect' is the last to be considered in extenso, and its sounds are described with the same basis of comparison as those of other dialects. Thus there is no explanation of the "AY" sound as in "take"; there are only explanations that: 'In the New England dialect, this long "a" may be almost a pure "AY" sound, rather than the "AY-EE" of General American'; in the Mountain dialect, 'This sound usually remains the same except that when it is drawled, it is of slightly longer duration than in General American and will be represented as "AY:"'; in Middle Western, 'This "AY" sound is generally elongated to "AY:" when final or before voiced consonants. . . . This elongation carries with it the sound of "EE," so that "AY: is actually "AY-EE."' The "AW" is produced from a forward position in the mouth' for Southern, 'richer . . . from a more forward position in the mouth' for New York City, 'from a relaxed position farther back in the mouth' for East

Texas, 'tense, forward' or 'farther back,' according to amount of drawl, for the Mountain dialect. For "uhEE" in New York City. The "uh" glide may be produced either from the back of the mouth or from the front.'

These comparative statements without any definition of points of reference hardly seem to promise efficient communication. Here again we have the weakness of avoiding a strict methodology. The author knows his reference, he feels the forward, back, richer, etc., but the terms simply do not mean the same to all men.

And yet—the book may well prove immensely valuable for amateur as well as professional actors who need to brush up on a specific dialect for practical use. The mere cumbersomeness of the symbols calls attention to the detail, and there's likely to be someone around to check up on the accomplishment. Perhaps the student may gain more from his own labor at transcribing the eye-dialect extracts, from working out intonational patterns from the small hints furnished, than he would from such extended phonetic and tonetic texts as would seem to be the greatest desiderata in a work of this sort. It probably isn't of much importance whether or not the actual interpretations of the dialects are altogether sound in detail.

LEE S. HULTZEN,
University of Illinois

Visible Speech. By RALPH K. POTTER, GEORGE A. KOPP, and HARRIET C. GREEN. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1947; pp. 441. $4.75.

The title of this book is rich in meaning. Readers in all phases of speech and related areas know that Melville Bell developed a system of phonetic symbolization which attempted to present the audible characteristics of speech in a visible form. He called this symbolization, visible speech. The motivation for his phonetics was the instruction of the deaf and it was this same interest which carried him from his phonetics ultimately to the telephone.

The modern visible speech has also come from the Bell Telephone Laboratories and is remarkably similar in intent to its predecessor. It was motivated to a considerable extent by the desire to help the deaf and, as with the development of the telephone, the present visible speech and the equipment associated with it have significance far beyond instruction of the deaf. It is an entirely new form of visual representation of sound and wherever there is an interest in the character or composition of sound, whether it be speech, song, bird sounds, machinery noises or heart beats, the methods of visible speech will contribute substantially.

The authors have constructed a beautifully illustrated volume containing the complete account of visible speech. They describe its development, explain how they have put it to use, and suggest some of the possibilities of additional application. They also express the hope that teachers and research workers will test its usefulness and suggest new applications.

The principle of the production of visible speech is relatively simple. A sound spoken into a microphone is passed through a set of filters which separate the lowest parts, or partials, in the complex sound from slightly higher partials and these in turn from somewhat higher partials and so on through an essential range of frequencies. The bands of frequencies which emerge from these filters activate glow lamps (or a special cathode ray tube, depending on the type of instrument) so that the flashing, or variation in intensity of the light, is photographed on a moving film or activates a moving phosphorescent screen. The highest partials are represented at the top of the resulting image, the lowest at the bottom and the others form a progressive series between. That is to say, the original sounds are divided into a series of parts which are presented as composite characteristic pictures.

These pictures can be learned and readily interpreted in continuous speech. In the latter part of Part I, Development and Basic Principles of Visible Speech, each of the sound unit patterns and the fundamental principles in reading them are presented. In Part II, Lesson Units: Visible Patterns of American Speech, methods of learning the sounds and sentences are set forth in systematic progressive lesson units. Part II can be considered a textbook of a new dynamic phonetics. It takes much of the guess work out of speech sound composition, assimilation, elision, glides, diphthongization, and similar problems.

Applications of Visible Speech is Part III of the book. The applications which have already been made are described and represent a substantial achievement, but the many suggested possibilities for future use and research are exciting. Areas of application include "Deaf Interests," "Phonetic Interests," "Speech Correction Interests," "Foreign Language Interests," "Vocal Music Interests," and "Generalities and Speculations" which include non-speech interests.

It seems quite probable that the development of visible speech will open an entirely new ap-

proach for the education of the deaf and for the study of the oral aspects of language. However, only the start has been made in methods and equipment. The authors point out that "the present situation is analagous in a way to the initial accomplishment of aeroplane flight. When the first plane left the ground for a brief journey through the air, it did not mean that these machines could immediately be made available for general use, but it did mean that man *could* fly and it established certain principles that were eventually built into machines that, after patient development, made possible aviation as it exists today. Similarly, we know speech can be made visible in its meaningful form because patterns have been produced and people have learned to read. We also know why these patterns are readable while those produced in the past were not. In other words, principles for the translation of speech in its meaningful patterns are established but a considerable amount of work remains. . . ."

The remaining work involves both the principles and the methods for the use of visible speech and the development of equipment. The equipment can and will be produced as the underlying principles are worked out. It is obviously a cooperative enterprise for education and engineering. Just now the greatest need is for education to assimilate and evaluate what has been accomplished and to make suggestions.

PAUL MOORE,
Northwestern University

Speech Correction: Principles and Methods. Revised edition. By C. VAN RIPER. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1947; pp. 470. $4.00.

Comprehensive textbooks on speech correction can be counted on less than the fingers of one hand. *Speech Correction: Principles and Methods* is one of them—in this reviewer's opinion one of the best. While most of the basic principles and methods which appear in the 1946 edition have not been radically changed, major portions of the book have been entirely rewritten in the 1947 edition. The recent revision represents a definite improvement in both content and readability. Essentially the revised edition adds to the contributions made by the earlier book in the following ways: (1) the text reads better; it is more interesting and less academic; (2) the material has been organized more systematically; (3) further helpful techniques have been added; (4) in a number of chapters, theories have been revised to fit in with recent research; (5) a better basis for the understanding of speech defects in terms of speech development has been provided; (6) the annotated bibliography has been revised and augmented; and (7) two new chapters have been added.

Chapter II of the old edition, "The Nature of Speech," has been omitted, and two brief additional chapters have been added, "Cerebral Palsy" and "Hearing Problems." In view of the frequent "severity of the associated speech defects," the author's treatment of the speech of the cerebral palsied and of the speech of individuals with hearing deficiencies could have been somewhat expanded, at least in the material dealing with hearing problems. However, the bibliographies for both of these chapters have been well selected and offer much supplemental material. The question arises whether the chapter on the "Nature of Speech" should have been deleted in the revision. The author in his revision probably has reconsidered that materials dealing with the anatomy and the physiology of the speech mechanism could be more logically and comprehensively treated by other related fields and, therefore, could give ground to the more essential principles and methods dealing with correction per se. It could be contended, however, that a book on speech correction should contain at least a brief discussion of the basic mechanism essential to the production of speech even though a more detailed treatment of this mechanism can be found in other fields of inquiry or other fields of speech and voice science. A brief discussion of the nature of speech, *i.e.*, the anatomy and physiology of the fundamental mechanism, might well have been included in the appendix, if not in the text proper. The omission, however, may be defended and does not impair the uniform excellence of the revised book. The chapters on the "Treatment of Articulatory Disorders" and the "Treatment of Stuttering" still remain among the best and most comprehensive in the literature.

The author's revision probably went to press before the publication of several relatively recent publications. Both of these workers are veterans in the field of speech therapy and have made important contributions to the field of speech correction through pioneer experimental programs in intensive group therapy and the conversational approach to speech training. Some material dealing with these approaches would have made a valuable contribution to this book.

While speech pathologists and correctionists may not subscribe in toto to the therapeutic methods expounded by Van Riper, *Speech Correction: Principles and Methods* should be con-

sidered a standard work in the field of speech therapy, and every worker in the field of speech defects and disorders should acquaint himself with the revision of this excellent book.

LEON LASSERS,
Oregon State Department of Education

Training the Singing Voice. By VICTOR ALEXANDER FIELDS. New York: King's Crown Press, 1947. pp. x+337. $4.00.

If anyone gathered from Professor Williamson's article on the training of voice specialists ["Symposium on Adequacy of Training of Voice Specialists," *Q.J.S.*, XXXII (February, 1946), 145-160] that the status of training the speaking voice reveals a considerable divergence of opinion, he should glance over this book. It exhibits in the matter of training the singing voice a divergence, not to say an opposition of theories and practices which is little short of chaotic. *Training the Singing Voice* is not a presentation of any one theory or technique; it attempts to assemble, classify, and analyze all the theories and techniques now or in the recent past in vogue. Although it is almost entirely concerned with the singing voice, it may offer for teachers of speech more information that will be of interest and possibly of profit.

From a bibliography of some 702 items, Professor Fields has extracted no fewer than 2946 statements of principle and practice, of which approximately 13 per cent are documented or supported by evidence. These statements have been organized under nine different areas, each of which has been subdivided into a number of "categories." The nine areas have to do with concepts of Vocal Pedagogy, Breathing, Phonation, Resonance, Range, Dynamics, Ear Training, Diction, and Interpretation. Under these areas are 162 categories, with 29 under Vocal Pedagogy, 22 under Breathing, 20 under Phonation, and so on. The difficulties of the problem of training the singing voice are adequately analyzed into some 21 statements, which reveal that (1) some of these difficulties are inherent in the subject (e.g., the subjective nature of singing itself), (2) there is a lack of scientific information, (3) there is a need for systematic teacher training, and (4) there is a general professional instability among singing teachers as regards preparation and standards.

As a result of the author's analysis of all the different and often conflicting concepts, he has concluded that there are three predominant schools of thought: the *empiricists*, who rely on trial and error observation; the *scientific group*, who seek underlying physical and physiological principles and attempt to base their teaching methods on those principles; and the *natural method group*, who seek only to remove restrictions "so that natural vocal reflexes take their course. . . . A basic limitation common to all three groups is the freedom with which authors make assumptions (often implicitly) that are never justified." (P. 243ff)

Typical of the conflict of theory and practice is the fact, shown in Table XI (pp. 247-249), that while thirteen teachers believe that vocal teaching can be standardized, eighteen believe that it cannot; direct control of the breathing organs is advised by twenty-four, and opposed by eleven. Thirty-one believe a low tongue is desirable, while nineteen believe that a free tongue is desirable. Twenty-one insist that conscious control of the throat is desirable, while sixteen believe that it is not. Seven believe that the larynx should move in phonation, seven that it should not. Forty-one maintain that the voice should be consciously focussed, while nineteen hold that it should not.

Extensive as are the sources from which Professor Fields has drawn his material, one wonders why there is so little reference to vocal theory and practice outside America. Of the first 200 references in the Bibliography, only 14 are English publications; no Continental sources appear at all. Have no French, German, Russian, or Italian teachers of singing written about their theories or techniques? Granted that few recent periodicals from Europe have come to this country, yet it does not seem possible that there should have been no such writings at all within the range of years covered from this investigation (1928 to 1942). This reviewer happens to know of an excellent study made some years ago on the breathing types of famous singers; it was published in a German periodical; and Metzger, cited as No. 395 in the Bibliography, himself gave a bibliography of three or four pages of European studies in phonation.

The chapters that may be of most interest to teachers of speech will probably be these: Breathing, Phonation, Resonance, and Dynamics. Not that these chapters will settle any moot point; but that they may point the way to further consideration of these factors in the production of voice for speaking. Possibly the greatest service the book itself might have to make to the teaching of speech is to reveal to us the importance of clarifying our own concepts.

and of basing our theories and pedagogy on something more than unwarranted assumptions.

GILES WILKESON GRAY,
Louisiana State University

Your Voice and Your Speech: Self-Training for Better Speaking. By BEATRICE DESFOUSSES. New York: Cattell and Company, Inc., 1946; pp. xiii+224. $3.50.

At the outset perhaps it had better be clearly understood that, though the author is herself a college teacher, this book is definitely not intended for use as a school textbook. But it is, we are told, aimed at "students of speech, experienced as well as inexperienced public speakers, and young actors and singers."

The subjects treated cover a wide range: overcoming fears, correct listening habits, thinking on the feet, six kinds of public speeches, articulation, voice quality, voice strengthening, resonance, singing, dramatic speech, radio speech, choral speech, storytelling, reading aloud, and phonetics.

The virtue of the book is that its author is possessed of many excellent ideas derived from her many years of teaching experience. Sage comments are to be found in many chapters of the work.

But there are a number of difficulties inherent in a self-help textbook which have not been satisfactorily overcome. No great measure of success can be achieved by any speaker, singer, or actor without an audience on which to practice. Obviously no book can supply hearers; but here the attempt is made, time and again, to suggest that practice should be held before "your speaking partner." Such suggestions and such practice are excellent, providing the user of the book can commandeer the services of any or all of these people; but the very reason most people seek such self-aid books is that they are usually afraid to talk before any audience, however select or understanding, or they lack the opportunity to practice for long periods before any group.

Furthermore, the very fact that this book is designed to appeal to three groups of people—singers, actors, speakers—forces it to range over many subjects. None of these is treated in any great detail; the seventeen chapters average less than twelve pages each in length; the speech of introduction is handled in two short paragraphs, and the commencement speech in twelve lines.

Nor is this the book's worst fault. It has already been observed that there are a number of good ideas in the text. There are; but they are not well arranged. There are huge gaps in thought from sentence to sentence; transitional devices are not used, and the reader has difficulty in moving logically from one idea to the next because of a kind of "jack rabbit" style of writing. The section on "Explanation in Conversation," for instance, goes through a step-by-step direction for eight sentences only to conclude with the words "Explain the subject under discussion from its beginning." Surely this should not have been the concluding, but the opening thought. Again, after discussing "Movement of the body," the author suggests "Exercises to relax the body," only to examine "The language of the body"; this turns out to be a treatment of bodily movement all over again. Examples of this kind of writing could be multiplied.

Much labor has undoubtedly been put into this volume. There are a considerable number of charts and diagrams sure to be useful, especially those on posture. But the coherence, unity, and emphasis expected of freshman writers should also be found in a self-help book; they are not to be discovered here, either in chapter arrangement or within chapters.

If readers can abide the general confusion to seek the nuggets which are scattered at random in the volume, they may be helped. But I fear few will have the strength to search.

THEODORE G. EHRSAM,
New York University.

Sleeping Beauty. By AGNES CURRAN HAMM. Milwaukee: The Tower Press, 1946; pp. 12. 50 cents.

Sleeping Beauty has been called "A Choral Speech Drama in rhyme," but it is more than that. Agnes Curran Hamm, whose other dramatizations, *The Pied Piper* and *Little Black Sambo*, have already established her as a successful author of choral dramas, has again taken a well-loved story and enhanced it with rhyme, rhythm, and a number of practical suggestions for effective stage or radio interpretation.

The story needs no retelling, but representative lines will indicate how Mrs. Hamm uses group response to carry the plot and suggest atmosphere.

Light Voices:

The king and the queen never ceased to pray,
Until in their palace one glorious day
A baby was born! Yes, a baby at last!
The news of the birth spread gayly and fast!

The kingdom rejoiced, and the bells in the steeple
Seemed to echo the joy of the happy people!
All: Ding-dong! Ding-dong!
A child is born! A child is born!
Ding-dong! Ding-dong!

Sleeping Beauty, with a playing time of 10 minutes exclusive of music, is recommended for the young. Intermediate and upper grades will enjoy its rhythm and older verse speaking choirs will enjoy presenting the fairytale to younger listeners. It has been adequately and artistically written by one who knows choral speaking technique and is able to impart the technique to others.

LOUISE ABNEY,
Kansas City Junior College

Man Against Myth. By BARROWS DUNHAM. Boston: Little, Brown, 1947; pp. 316.

This book is required reading for every teacher of public speaking. Not because the work is without its imperfections, but because they are negligible in contrast to the fundamental soundness of the author's analysis which has an important bearing upon many problems of rhetorical criticism and persuasion. The problem Dunham assumes is stated in the first chapter:

> Plenty of myths still survive about the nature of the universe. . . . These gentle illusions, however, have no place in physical science as such. It is different with social science. Myths abound concerning the nature of society; and these myths will be found, stretched screaming over many a long volume, in the very heart of the science itself. There can be few tasks more important than to remove these myths, and thus to instill health and vigor into man's most valuable study—that of his own nature and destiny.

Subsequently, Barrows Dunham undertakes to examine the basis and function of ten major social myths: That You Don't Change Human Nature, That the Rich are Fit and the Poor Unfit, That There are Superior and Inferior Races, That There are Two Sides to Every Question, That Thinking Makes It So, That You Cannot Mix Art and Politics, That You Have to Look Out for Yourself, That all Problems Are Merely Verbal, That Words will Never Hurt Me, That You Cannot Be Free and Safe. One can recognize in these so-called myths some of the fundamental social issues of our day, and that they recur time and time again as the point upon which arguments and debates turn. As a matter of fact, in most discussions on contemporary issues these "myths" *are* the issue.

Writing in a style that is delightful to read, Dunham delivers an incisive analysis, demonstrating a grasp of logic and an acuity that is apt to make the reader envious. Each chapter, a separate essay in itself, is an excellent demonstration of argument, usually of the highest order. Even if the reader will not always reach the same conclusion as does Dunham, following his analysis will do much to clarify one's own thinking.

Of more special interest to the teacher of speech will be the eighth and ninth myths: All Problems are Merely Verbal, and Words Will Never Hurt Me. Here Dunham makes a serious attack upon general semantics as developed by Korzybski and his devotees. It is a serious attack, not only because of the force and sharpness of his argument, but also because general semantics has become such a fad in the field of speech. Dunham argues—and makes an excellent case—that, assuming Korzybski's own premises, general semantics, as a system, is invalid. In doing so, he helps immeasurably in overcoming the impasse of being unable to reach even a tentative or partial conclusion by employing the methods of general semantics. Dunham's point is simply that "Semantics are full of admiration for science; they invoke it with a solemnity which was once reserved for religion alone. Nevertheless, it will not be difficult to show that, if the views of the semanticists are correct, there can be no science of anything. And especially, there can be no science of society."

This is not a charge that can be dismissed lightly; and when Dunham presents argument after argument to substantiate his assertion, it becomes incumbent upon the student or scholar to re-examine the claims of the semanticists. At times Dunham is more contentious than argumentative; and occasionally he gives way to a tendency to overstate his position; but nevertheless, his is a book that will repay careful reading.

IRWIN LEE GLATSTEIN,
School of Religion at the University of Oklahoma

How To Create Sound Effects for Home Recordings. By ED LUDES and HALLOCK B. HOFFMAN. California: The Castle Press, 1946; pp. 90. $1.50.

This is a valuable handbook for sound effects men in radio and the theatre, as well as for makers of home recordings. It supplies well-

illustrated directions for producing more than 150 sounds ranging from the flutter of pigeons' wings to the roar of an erupting volcano. The authors have written for the novice and have treated their material thoroughly.

DONALD B. TESCHER,
Kenyon College

Remembrance of Amherst. An Undergraduate's Diary 1846-1847 (William Gardiner Hammond). Edited by GEORGE F. WHICHER. New York: Columbia University Press, 1946; pp. 307. $3.00.

On July 9, 1847, Rufus Choate and Daniel Webster argued the Oliver Smith Will Case in Northampton, Massachusetts. One of the descriptions of the trial has been an entry in a diary of a student at nearby Amherst College. For an unspecified time, this diary has been in the Library of the Law College of the State University of Iowa. The publication of the manuscript has interest not only to students of Choate and Webster, but to persons interested in the speaking activities of college students a century ago. William Gardiner Hammond, later a Professor of Law and Chancellor of a University, chronicled the events of a 19th century college student at Amherst and entered penetrating judgments about rhetorical practices. The book has general significance as a case history in education and particular relevance to training in speech.

JOHN W. BLACK,
Kenyon College

IN THE PERIODICALS

MARIE HOCHMUTH, *Editor*

RHETORIC, RADIO, AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

CHESTER, GIRAUD, "Power of the Radio Commentator," *The American Mercury*, LXV (September, 1947), 334-339.

"Radio has come to supersede the school, the church and the press as America's number one source of news and opinion." Chester presents a general introduction to a series of articles analyzing radio commentators.

CLARK, THOMAS D., "The American Backwoodsman in Popular Portraiture," *Indiana Magazine of History*, XLII (March, 1947), 1-28.

"Politics, political speakings, elections, barbecues, and burgoos all went together. It was not so much a matter of holding office that was important to the backwoodsman as was the excellent excuse for being in a crowd and having a central theme of local interest to excite him." Clark presents a study in social-cultural history of the early ninteenth century.

DEMOS, RAPHAEL, "The Art of Communication or Rhetoric," *The Journal of General Education*, I (January, 1947), 136-142.

"We cannot be a wholly integrated society until we have a pervasive civilized language of our own by which proper communication between experts and laymen may be established." Demos discusses the importance of rhetoric, concluding that "While the means of communication of mind with mind have steadily been multiplying, there has been perhaps increasingly less reflection and study devoted to communication as a subject."

FEST, THORREL B., "It Doesn't Trickle Down," *The Gavel*, XXIX (January, 1947), 21-23.

"In the broad sense we are depending on the skill in the use of the tools of democracy—discussion, debate, and related activities—to trickle down to the great mass of citizens. The evidence at hand seems to indicate that this trickle is not fast enough. If the stream of knowledge doesn't run faster, the race against ignorance, prejudice, self-interest, and ultimate catastrophe will be lost." Fest urges "advancement" in the character of forensic activity.

FINK, CORNELIUS W., "The Function of Debate in Adult and Adolescent Education," *Bulletin of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges*, XIII (March, 1947), 2-7.

The writer has as his thesis that "the proper function of debate is to accomplish not only the development of the 'open-mind,' but to bring to that 'open-mind' significant information on problems of national and international importance and, moreover, train and prepare responsible and trustworthy leadership skilled in techniques of effective analysis and skillful presentation."

HOOK, SIDNEY, "The 'Laws' of Dialectic," *Polemic*, VI (November-December, 1946), 9-29.

Hook analyzes and takes issue with Engels' concpetion of dialectic as the "science of extremely general, comprehensive, and, therefore, important laws of development in nature, history and thought," concluding that the dialectic method "can claim to have meaning and validity only when it is understood to be synonomous with scientific method."

JOHNSON, STANLEY, "John Donne and the Virginia Company," *ELH; A Journal of English Literary History*, XIV (June, 1947), 127-138.

"Few of John Donne's sermons have more often been commented upon than the one preached before the Virginia Company of London on 13 November 1622, but since the comments have been insufficiently based on an examination of the company's record and contemporary publications about the colony, all of them are incomplete and often inaccurate." Johnson describes Donne's relations with the company, discusses the occasion of the sermon, and the significance of its theme at the time of its delivery.

JOHNSON, WENDELL, "How to Ask a Question," *The Journal of General Education*, I (April, 1947), 206-210.

Johnson believes it reasonable to assume that "a major responsibility of our schools and colleges is that of providing adequate instruction in the techniques of fruitful inquiry. And if this

responsibility is to be taken seriously, rather more emphasis is to be placed on the questions students ask, and relatively less on the answers they regurgitate, than is apparently customary." The technique of inquiry is discussed.

JONES, PHILIP CHAPIN, "Communication in Philosophy," *Philosophy of Science*, XIV (April, 1947), 164-170.

"In the ultimate anlaysis, all philosophical differences are verbal. If by some intellectual x-ray we could see into the minds of others, and perceive the exact nature of their concepts, we should be forced to concede the correctness of their conclusions." Jones points out some of the difficulties of uniform interpretation in regard to concepts.

LEE, IRVING J., "Why Discussions Go Astray," *Etc: A Review of General Semantics*, IV (Winter, 1947), 81-88.

On the assumption that the study of the sources of conflict might throw light on the process of understanding, patterns of disintegration were looked for in fifty discussion groups. Lee summarizes some of the preliminary findings which came from focusing attention on the character of the understandings shown by the participants of what was said, concluding that "the points of breakdown in gronp discussions are many and varied."

MACLEISH, ARCHIBALD, "The People's Peace," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXX (July, 1947), 54-58.

"The development of the media of mass communication in the short generation between the wars has changed the kind of peace which can now be made by changing the opportunities for contact between peoples—their contact not as nations or as governments but as human societies influencing each other through their manners, their customs, their traditions, their convictions, their arts, their lives." Problems of peace are discussed.

NAHM, MILTON C., "The Functions of Art and Fine Art in Communication," *The Journal of Aesthetics & Art Criticism*, V (June, 1947), 278-280.

"We live in a world in which it is increasingly evident that problems of mutual understanding and intercommunication may not with impunity be relegated to discussion in academic halls; a world, in fact, in which we must surmount barriers of cultural differences or suffer dire consequences." The writer discusses the functions of art in communication.

NICHOLSON, HAROLD, "On Human Misunderstanding," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXX (July, 1947), 113-114.

Nicholson suggests that anyone who has had experience of public speaking or lecturing will agree "that whereas the limits of human understanding are strictly confined, there are no limits to human misunderstanding." He advances the thesis that "there is a wide gap between the ordinary citizen's powers of understanding and the language in which he is addressed." The character of lecture audiences is discussed, along with the general problem of comprehension.

NISWENDER, DANA W., "Divided We Fall," *The English Journal*, XXXVI (June, 1947), 307-309.

Acutely conscious of the implicit use of racial stereotypes in the various communications media, the writer argues that "all teachers, and especially English teachers, should be sensitive to such stereotypes and should exclude from class use material which perpetuates stereotypes." Niswender discusses racial stereotypes in the various language vehicles, such as plays, movies, and novels.

POPPER, K. R., "New Foundations for Logic," *Mind, A Quarterly Review of Psychology and Philosophy*, LVI (July, 1947), 193-235.

"Logic ought to be simple; and, in a way, even trivial." Popper discusses the source of complications in logic and lays down "a few very simple primitive rules" of deductive inference, or derivability.

ROBERTS, JOHN B., "Adapting Forensic Activities for Radio," *Bulletin of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges*, XIII (March, 1947), 14-18.

"Debate coaches seem to forget that they are being given a valuable commodity—that air time costs and is worth dollars and cents." Roberts analyzes the problem of making debates attractive to radio audiences.

SPENCE, HARTZELL, "Let's Be Fair to Radio," *The Pacific Spectator*, I (Summer, 1947), 339-351.

"Columnists, newspapers, professional critics, lecturers, magazines, and scores of organizations have set up radio as a target, and have proceeded to bang away at it with a great deal of ammunition." Spence analyzes the criticism directed against radio and the condition of public taste.

STEUERT, DOM HILARY, "The English Prose Style of Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, 1557," *The Modern Language Review*, XLI (July, 1947), 225-236.

The writer indicates that "there were more models of English prose available in the sixteenth century than most literary historians have realized." The sermon style of Thomas Watson is discussed in comparison with the literary style of Cranmer.

WRIGHT, LOUIS B., "Literature in the Colonial South," *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, X (May, 1947), 297-315.

"From 1750 onward there was an increasing flood of political writing, and by 1760 literary effort was already being translated into the kind of oratory, satirical verse, and polemics which would occupy such a large place in the intellectual activities of the Southern colonies in the Revolutionary period." Wright discusses the character of the writing of the Colonial South.

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION

EVANS, DINA REES, "Give Dramatic Art its Due," *NEA Journal*, (April, 1947), 276-277.

Evans reports results of an experiment designed to discover the effect of participations in dramatics on personality development. Forty recognized 'problem cases' were among the 75 boys and girls tested. The writer concludes that the scores on the personality tests of the students taking dramatic art "indicated a discernible trend toward greater balance and equilibrium. Those taking regular English grew, just as positively, worse."

GILLETTE, A. S., "Painting and Lighting the Setting," *Dramatics*, XVIII (May, 1947), 10, 11.

"Just as the actor uses his make-up to alter his appearance, to give some indication of his age, his nationality, his health and to some extent his state of mind, we find the clever scene designer doing the same tricks with scene paints as he paints his setting." Gillette presents the seventh in a series of articles on designing scenery for the stage.

GRANVILLE-BARKER, HARLEY, "Verse and Speech in *Coriolanus*," *The Review of English Studies*, XXIII (January, 1947), 1-15.

"The story of *Coriolanus* is pre-eminently one of public life; and throughout the play—from Menenius' persuasive tale of the Belly and the Members to Marcius' last desperate haranguing of his Volscian masters—scene after scene offers dramatically legitimate occasion for eloquence. There is much variety in occasion too, as of speaker and temper of speech." Granville-Barker discusses verse and speech in *Coriolanus*.

HOOLE, W. STANLEY, "Shakespere on the Ante-Bellum Charleston Stage," *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, XXI (January, 1946), 37-45.

"That Shakespere's plays were popular with ante-bellum Charleston audiences is putting it conservatively." A table of Shakespeare's plays presented in Charleston between 1800-1860 is presented.

KRUTCH, JOSEPH WOOD, "O'Neill's Tragic Sense," *The American Scholar*, XVI (Summer, 1947), 283-290.

With the exception of Maxwell Anderson, whose "methods are very different," O'Neill "is the only American playwright who has persistently attempted to make tragedy bridge the gulf between what we consciously acknowledge about ourselves, and the world of feeling which continues a subterranean existence." The writer discusses O'Neill's sense of tragedy and his significance as a playwright.

LAUFE, A. L., "Not So New in the Theatre," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, XLVI (July, 1947), 384-389.

"Perhaps the variation on screen, on stage, and in radio are new. Perhaps the situations arising in current stories are modern innovations. But the basic qualities of drama that have universal audience appeal are too well founded in the old legends and medieval literature to be considerd as new in the theatrical world." Laufe relates modern drama and theatricals and movies to their medieval forbears.

LEECH, CLIFFORD, "The Implications of Tragedy," *English*, VI (Spring, 1947), 177-182.

"The gulf betwen the learned use and the popular use of the same word is nowhere better illustrated than in 'tragedy'." Leech attempts a clarification of notions about tragedy by discussing it in terms of psychology.

MALCOLM, J. E., "Maeterlinck and Static Drama," *English*, VI (Spring, 1947), 183-186.

The stress on the need for "something new" is one of the most curious features of Maeterlinck's dramatic theory. The writer discusses the subject of modern tragedy and Maeterlinck's theory of the proper subject matter of static drama.

MORRISON, THEODORE, "'The Fault, Dear Brutus'," *The Pacific Spectator*, I (Summer, 1947), 235-250.

Poetic doctrine in recent times "has been concerned with, and perhaps almost obsessed by, technique." Morrison discusses leading contemporary poets and current doctrines regarding the technique and contents of poetry.

PEARSON, TALBOT, "Directing the One-Act Melodrama," *Dramatics*, XVIII (April, 1947), 6, 7.

"The essentials of good melodrama are concern with plot rather than ideas, with external motivation as against an inner conflict." Pearson presents the sixth in a series of articles devoted to the discussion of the one-act play.

PEARSON, TALBOT, "Directing the One-Act Fantasy," *Dramatics*, XVIII (May, 1947), 8-10.

At the opposite pole from the realistic drama, fantasy is "the language of escape and offers unlimited opportunities for imagination and variety of treatment." Pearson presents the seventh in a series of articles on the one-act play.

POIRIER, MICHEL, "Sidney's Influence upon A Midsummer Night's Dream," *Studies in Philology*, XLIV (July, 1947), 483-489.

A Midsummer Night's Dream reveals Shakespeare's use of "another work by Sidney, the Defense of Poesie, which has never been mentioned hitherto among his sources." Poirier discusses this "newly discovered source" as a further and valuable token of the interest Shakespeare took in all the various aspects of the English literature of his own day.

PRIOR, MOODY E., "Character in Relation to Action in Othello," *Modern Philology*, XLIV (May, 1947), 225-237.

"When the basis of understanding of Shakespeare's characters is sought in the ethical and moral speculation and the technical psychology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the results seem, on the whole more impressive." Prior analyzes the technique of characterization and action in *Othello*.

STUART, MARION, "Building an Amateur Audience," *Dramatics* XVIII (April, 1947), 10.

"Excellent choice of plays, sincerity in interpretation, and efficiency in production will exercise an important influence in persuading audiences to return to the school theatre irrespective of the particular type of play showing." Stuart discusses the responsibility of the director in bringing a variety of types of plays before the high school audience.

VOADEN, HERMAN, "UNESCO and a World Theatre," *Theatre Arts*, XXXI (July, 1947), 23-26.

"UNESCO, in making the people aware of the arts of other nations, will encourage them to appreciate and stimulate their own." Voaden traces the movement for world theatre from Firmin Gémier's foundation of the Societé Universelle du Théâtre in 1926 to UNESCO, outlining the projected program of the latter in regard to the theatre.

VON UNRUH, FRITZ, "Looking at the Theatre," *Theatre Arts*, XXXI (July, 1947), 49, 50.

"Does imagination today seek other forms of realization? Has the stage become only a toy that can no longer satisfy a more mature mankind?" The new theatre, according to the writer, must set as its goal that of carrying the message of peace and brotherhood, but to achieve that goal "the playwright must have with him not only his actors but his public."

WILSON, CLARA, AND ANNE CHRISTENSEN, "Choral Speaking," *The Nebraska Educational Journal* XXVII (May, 1947), 151.

Choral singing or speaking performances are "profitable in many ways to the participants and, when ably directed, pleasing to the listeners." The pleasures and benefits of choral speaking are discussed.

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS

BERGMANN, GUSTAV, "Sense Data, Linguistic Conventions, and Existence," *Philosophy of Science*, XIV (April, 1947), 152-163.

In the sixth of a series of articles which the writer believes to be a "complete analysis of the realism issue from a positivistic view point," the question of the terminology of sense data and linguistic conventions is discussed.

BLACK, MAX, "The Limitations of a Behavioristic Semiotic," *The Philosophical Review*, LVI (May, 1947), 258-272.

Black asks the question whether Charles Morris, author of *Signs, Language, and Behavior*, has been able to show that a simple vocabulary of 'stimulus,' 'response,' and cognate 'behavioristic' terms is all we need for the description, analysis, and evaluation of all discourse. Or does his careful and detailed discussion reveal, rather, the inadequacy of the tools with which he has chosen to work? The writer attempts to show that "the second alternative is the right one."

CHERBENEAU, ALICE F., "Bringing up the Family Semantically," *Etc: A Review of General Semantics*, IV (Winter, 1947), 95-105.

A mother relates her experiences with applying many of Korzybski's suggestions for teaching linguistic structure to children in order to bring about in them appropriate adjustment.

COGAN, HERBERT J., "General Semantics in Educational Practice," *Etc: A Review of General Semantics*, IV (Spring, 1947), 220-223.

"That our education system must be charged with vitality is a basic assumption few will deny; yet the search for vital principles has led many educators astray." Cogan argues that the grade and high school provide an ideal environment for the combined efforts of general semanticists and educators for the task of preparing the student to participate actively and with understanding in society.

EBERHART, WILFRED, "Language and Human Relations," *The English Journal*, XXXVI (June, 1947), 304-307.

"We need to study not language but language-as-used-by-men. If we study it long enough and deeply enough, perhaps we shall develop that wisdom which will enable us to live in understanding with our fellow-men everywhere." Eberhart is concerned with the power of words, stereotypes, and their abuse.

FRIES, CHARLES C., "Implications of Modern Linguistic Science," *College English*, VIII (March, 1947), 314-320.

"The problems of English in our times demand the pooling of all our different types of knowledge and experience." Fries deals with language history, structural linguistics, and formal signals of structural meaning.

HAYAKAWA, S. I., "Semantics, General Semantics," *Etc: A Review of General Semantics*, IV (Spring, 1947), 161-170.

Hayakawa's article for the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, dealing with the history of semantics, its motivation as a movement, and its writers is reprinted.

HODSON, GEOFFREY, "Dialect Geography," *The Speech Fellowship News Letter*, XXXV (July, 1947), 1.

Hodson reports the address of L. R. Palmer, Professor of Classics, King's College, London, to the Folk-lore Society, in which Palmer discussed the plans of the Philological Society for a complete survey of British dialects.

NORTH, RICHARD, "Semantics, the Science of Mutual Understanding," *The Hibbert Journal*, XLV (April, 1947), 227-233.

"To the difficulties inherent in language itself there must be added two others of a different character—the carelessness of communicators and the lassitude of listeners." The writer suggests the necessity of a union of semantics and psychology in order to arrive at a better understanding of the relationship of thought and behavior.

ROBINSON, FRANCIS P., "The Effect of Language Style on Reading Performance," *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXVIII (March, 1947), 149-156.

"So much emphasis has been placed on vocabulary counts in books that the importance of familiarity with language style in determining reading comprehension has been neglected." Robinson attempts to show how markedly reading comprehension may be affected by complexity of language structure, and deals with factors determining skill in reading complex materials.

STRICKLAND, RUTH G., "The Language and Mental Development of Children," *Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University*, XXIII (March, 1947), 5-29.

Strickland's purpose was "to gather some of the thoughts and findings of students of language and child development and to present them for the consideration of parents and teachers." Thirteen aspects of the language problem are discussed.

JONES, MARVIN F., "Critical Survey of the Lempert Endaural Fenestration Operation," *The Laryngoscope*, LVII (April, 1947), 263-271.

"Perhaps the greatest contribution to otology which the fenestration operation can make is the opportunity to know more about the physiology, physics and chemistry of the structures concerned in hearing." Jones discusses critically the various aspects of diagnosis, therapy, dangers, and prognostication.

KOESTER, THEODORE, and W. N. SCHOENFELD, Some Comparative Data on Differential Pitch Sensitivity under Quantal and Non-Quantal Conditions," *The Journal of General Psychology*, XXXVI (January, 1947), 107-112.

The writers present reports of research conducted with highly practiced subjects for differential pitch sensitivity under two methods of stimulus presentations: a quantal procedure and a modified form of constant stimuli. Aside

from a comparison of the methods, the writers were also interested in finding out whether quantal findings could be duplicated.

MANCHESTER, HARLAND, "Strange New Uses of Sound," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXX (September, 1947), 54-58.

"In corporation and university laboratories throughout the world, research men are doing all manner of uncanny tricks with sounds both heard and unheard. Sound has become a tool with great potentialities in science, industry, and medicine." Manchester discusses some of the current laboratory experiments with ultrasonic waves, and presents some of the many uses that are at present being made of sound waves.

MORRIS, D. W., "The Speech Sciences and Other Educational and Community Functions," *Journal of Educational Research*, XL (April, 1947), 608-614.

"As a social function speech is of interest to all those concerned with human living together; as a personal function it is of interest to those concerned with processes and activities within the individual; and as a physical function it interests those interested in sound and its transmission, the physicists." The writer indicates the relationships which develop as such a threefold nature of speech sciences is pursued and suggests the need for cooperation.

NEU, D. M., "A Critical Review of the Literature on 'Absolute Pitch'," *Psychological Bulletin*, XLIV (May, 1947), 249-266.

"In view of the fact that an inborn quality has been accepted so generally as an explanation of accurate pitch discrimination, one might hesitate to offer any other explanation if it were not for the fact that no real evidence has been presented to prove that there is such a quality." Neu criticizes the definitions, theories, and experiments relating to absolute pitch from an interbehavioral standpoint.

SCHNEIDER, RAYMOND, "Put Your Voice on Wire," *Science Illustrated*, II (March, 1947), 90-91.

"If you're an average hobbyist with an elementary knowledge of radio and machine work, you can make your own wire recorder." Schneider presents instructions for making wire recorders, and the process of recording and erasing.

SHAW, W. A., E. B. NEWMAN, and I. J. HIRSH, "The Difference Between Monaural and Binaural Thresholds," *The Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XXXVII (June, 1947), 229-242.

"The binaural threshold for speech intelligibility behaves in the same manner as does the binaural threshold for pure tones. When the two ears are presented with speech which is functionally equal in intensity, the binaural threshold is approximately three db. lower than that of either ear alone." The writers have as their purpose that of reviewing critically the experiments concerned with the difference between monaural and binaural thresholds, and reporting results of three new sets of measurements made by different methods.

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH

ALEXANDER, HENRY, "A Programme for English," *Queen's Quarterly*, LIV (Spring, 1947), 34-46.

"The cultivation of good speech habits would do a great deal towards solving difficulties in the use of the written language." Alexander discusses the main objectives of instruction in English and the means used to attain these objectives, and suggests a few ways in which the teaching of this subject might be improved. Increased emphasis on spoken English is recommended.

DARLINGTON, OSCAR G., "Gerbert, the Teacher," *The American Historical Review*, LII (April, 1947), 456-576.

In Gerbert's school, rhetoric was "a very practical study related most realistically to current affairs and efficient living, and not, as it later became in some medieval universities, largely an intellectual maneuver divorced both from practical life and productive philosophy." Darlington discusses Gerbert's teaching methods and results.

JONES, EMILY, "Children Should Learn to Talk!," *The Instructor*, LVI (September, 1947), 22ff.

"Practices that stimulate children to express themselves orally and encourage them to write should comprise the greater part of language development in the primary grades, and should not be neglected in the higher grades." The writer discusses methods and opportunities for oral communication in the primary grades.

KAVANAGH, JAMES P., "High School Speech—1947," *New York State Education*, XXXIV (Summer Number, 1947), 688, 689.

Fearing that "we have allowed the depression of 1928 and the recent war almost to wreck our

once proud program," Kavanagh calls attention to the "present inertia in one of our great basic needs—speech education."

MORRIS, EMMET, "Simulated Radio," *See & Hear*, II (April, 1947), 33ff.

Children of the Irving elementary school in Maywood, Illinois, use the master public address radio system to vitalize many of the subjects which they study. Simulated radio as a teaching device is discussed.

MURPHY, ELOISE CRONIN, "Make Them Speak," *The English Journal*, XXXVI (June, 1947), 316-319.

"Whatever the cause, something must be done to overcome the poor expression of American boys and girls. They must learn to talk, not 'jabber,' and it is the job of the English teacher to train them to talk." The writer urges English teachers to overcome any hesitance to undertake the job of speech-training. "One does not need the ability and experience of an elocutionist to get results in speech development any more than one has to be an author to train pupils to write."

NOEL, ELIZABETH GOUDY, "Good Listening . . . New Proficiency in the Language Arts," *See & Hear*, II (April, 1947), 32ff.

"Radio, records, and transcriptions can be used effectively to help students develop listening habits." The writer discusses the process of developing listening habits, believing that improving listening tastes is as important an objective of English as the development of reading tastes.

PINE, TILLIE S., "We Dramatize the United Nations," *Childhood Education*, XXIII (May, 1947), 435, 436.

"Children often show a social awareness which is way beyond their years, their background or their scholastic abilities." Pine discusses the use of dramatizations in developing concepts of world events in children. Dramatization of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco is presented.

STEELE, MARY DALE, "School Radio—Millstone or Milestone?" *The Nation's Schools*, LX (July, 1947), 58ff.

"Teachers are beginning to see in radio the treasure of communication that has gone virtually untapped for purposes of education for nearly a quarter of a century." Steele discusses the success of radio in the Omaha schools.

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

BACKUS, OLLIE, and HARRIET DUNN, "Use of Conversation Patterns to Promote Speed and Retention of Learning," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (June, 1947), 135-142.

"Two of the most persistent problems in the field of speech rehabilitation are (1) how to get transfer of normal speech production into real conversation, and (2) how to cut down the frequency and extent of relapse after clinical training." The writers, having been engaged for four years in a research program designed to seek for solutions to the problems, present some of the findings of the study.

BRODY, BABETTE S., "Hearing Loss Isn't Funny!" *The High School Journal*, XXX (May, 1947), 146, 147.

"Of the thirteen to fifteen million people in the United States with some degree of hearing loss, about three million suffer defects severe enough to constitute a handicap to normal communication and everyday living." The writer argues that needs in the field of hearing will be met only as individuals and the public become interested in them and as health education takes hold.

DOOB, LEONARD W., "The Behavior of Attitudes," *Psychological Review*, LIV (May, 1947), 135-156.

"The telling question to ask concerning attitude is: Does the term belong in a set of systematic theories which together approximate something that might be called science?" Answering the question, "No," Doob, without meaning to criticize other definitions or usages of the term *attitude*, attempts "systematically, if partially, to relate the concept of attitude to what is known as behavior theory."

DUNCAN, MELBA HURD, "Personality Adjustment Techniques in Voice Therapy," *The Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (June, 1947), 161-167.

"Medical examination so often reveals no pathological condition to account for extremely hoarse, harsh, 'tight' voice. Exercise in breath control and relaxation, efforts to achieve 'open throat' and optimum pitch, often fail to effect any carryover outside of the exercise period." Duncan, believing that incidence of hoarseness varies greatly with locale, presents methods for approaching the personality component in harsh voices in a discussion of therapy as applied to a special group of patients at Brooklyn College.

DUNLAP, ALBERT M., and HAROLD F. SCHUKNECHT, "Closure of Perforations of the Tympanic Membrane," *The Laryngoscope*, LVII (July, 1947), 479-490.

"A very old method of repair of perforations of the drum membrane, consisting of repeated applications of trichloracetic acid to the perforation margins, with the proper use of urea solution and removal of marginal exudates, can be successfully used in selected cases." The writers discuss the treatment of the tympanic membrane.

FOWLER, EDMUND PRINCE, "The Percentage of Capacity to Hear Speech, and Related Disabilities," *The Laryngoscope, LVII* (February, 1947), 103-113.

Fowler presents directions for determining binaural loss in capacity to hear speech.

HASKINS, ELIZABETH M., "Preparing the Hard of Hearing Child to Compete with the Outside World," *The Volta Review*, XLIX (June, 1947), 276ff.

In cases of the hard of hearing, "a winning personality" is the child's greatest asset in mixing with the outside world, as well as at home. A mother of a hard-of-hearing child discusses problems of rehabilitation.

HOMES, EUGENE C., as told to Greer Williams, "I Stopped Stammering," *Colliers*, CXX (August 9, 1947), 52ff.

"Why should a stammerer have to wait until he is a man and then try to find someone to teach him the ABC's of normal speech? Why shouldn't all children be taught how to get the most out of their voices?" Once a patient at the District Speech Clinic, Washington, D. C., Eugene Homes, now completely cured of stuttering, recounts the frustrations of childhood and adolescence as a stutterer, the difficulties of securing a job when one is handicapped, rejection from the Army, the search for aid in his trouble, false promises of quack therapists, and ultimate success in the hands of a skilled clinician.

KASTEIN, SHULAMITH, "The Chewing Method of Treating Stuttering," *The Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (June, 1947), 195-198.

"Extensive work has been done and profuse statistics have been reported on the biochemical, physiological, psychological, rhythmokinetic, and various others aspects of this speech disorder" of stuttering, "but it is surprising how little one gains from the literature concerning therapy." Kastein discusses Emil Froeschel's method of treating stutterers, based on the conception that speech emanates from the function of chewing.

KELLEY, JOSEPH D., "Surgery of the Larynx in Bilateral Abductor Paralysis," *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, CXXXIV (July 12, 1947), 944-946.

Kelly finds that "more thought and interest has been shown in the surgical treatment of bilateral paralysis of the abductor muscles of the larynx since 1939 than in any other equivalent period in the history of medicine." A review of the literature of arytenoidectomy is presented.

LEHMAN, CHARLES H., "The Telesonic System," *The Volta Review*, XLIX (June, 1947), 263, 264.

Since 1930, "in hundreds of theatres throughout the world, Theatrephone installations have been made, and thousands of hard-of-hearing theatre loving persons were brought back to the theatre, and with them, their families who often stayed away from the theatre because of the hearing problem." Theatrephone installations are discussed, along with the use of the improved Multitone Electric Company's system of induction pick-up.

LORGE, IRVING, "Gains in Hearing Capacity in A Two Year Period for Hearing Aid and Control Groups," *American Annals of the Deaf*, XCI (November, 1946), 391-396.

"Using a hearing aid may affect the person wearing the aid psychologically and physiologically." Lorge presents a report of the differences in the gains (or losses) on audiometric examinations between children who used a hearing aid and children who did not.

MARSTERS, JAMES C., "Motor Vehicle Laws Concerning Deaf and Hard of Hearing Drivers," *The Volta Review*, XLIX (February, 1947), 69-71ff.

"Most states agree that deaf and hard of hearing drivers are safer ones than the unhandicapped drivers, because the handicapped driver pays more attention to his driving; this has been statistically proven." Various state requirements and restrictions for hard of hearing drivers are discussed.

MAYERS, ALBERT NORDEMAN, and ELISABETH B. MAYERS, "Grammar-Rhetoric Indicator," *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, CIV (December, 1946), 604-610.

"Many books have been written concerning language and words—their origins and signifi-

cance, both denotative and connotative—but studies of the psychiatric implications from analyzing the grammar and rhetoric of mental patients and the normal have lagged behind." The writers define the Grammar-Rhetoric Indicator, and illustrate its use in the understanding and diagnosis of mental patients.

McCaskey, Carl H., "Aphonia," *The Annals of Otology, Rhinology & Laryngology*, LV (September, 1946), 524-530.

The writer discusses etiological and therapeutic factors in functional aphonia. A series of cases is presented.

McIntire, J. Thomas, "On the Education of the Cerebral Palsied," *The Journal of Educational Research*, XL (April, 1947), 561-568.

McIntire presents a study considering the school achievement of a comparatively large group of unselected cerebral palsied children with special emphasis on some of the factors that interfere with normal learning. The writer concludes that "the principal factors, among others, considered responsible for school retardation in cerebral palsied children were the lack of adequate school opportunity, the extensive and complicated nature of the physical handicaps, the high incidence of mental retardation in the group, and sensory handicaps which are present much more frequently than in an unselected group of public school children."

Meyers, Russell, "Johnson's 'People in Quandaries,' Its Significance for Psychopathology," *Etc: A Review of General Semantics*, IV (Spring, 1947), 171-181.

There has existed "strong need for a systematic presentation of the physiologic and psychologic substrates of general semantics as these appear to the trained psychologist. The need has been eminently met in Wendell Johnson's recent book, *People in Quandaries*." The significance of the book in relation to psychopathology is discussed.

Michels, Lt. Col. Merrill W., and Lt. Clark T. Randt, "Galvanic Skin Response in the Differential Diagnosis of Deafness," *Archives of Otolaryngology, XLV* (March, 1947), 302-311.

"The need for clearcut differentiation in the diagnosis and separation of organic from psychogenic deafness is apparent." The writers offer an objective method utilizing the galvanic skin response. Illustrative cases are presented.

Moorhead, Robert L., "Fenestration for Otosclerosis," *Archives of Otolaryngology*, XLV (January, 1947), 49-66.

"That the Lempert fenestration operation will restore practical, serviceable hearing to a large percentage of patients with clinical otosclerosis is no longer doubted except by a few of the most skeptical otologists. That the improvement of hearing is permanent is probable." Moorhead answers the question, "What cases are suitable for fenestration operation?" and discusses complications.

New, Gordon B., "Congenital Cysts of the Tongue, the Floor of the Mouth, the Pharynx and the Larnyx," *Archives of Otolaryngology*, XLV (February, 1947), 145-158.

"Congenital cysts of the tongue, the floor of the mouth, the pharynx and the larynx are rare but are particularly interesting because of the difficulty of their diagnosis and the problem of their complete removal." Various types of cysts are discussed.

Nichols, Rudolph H., "Physical Characteristics of Hearing Aids," *The Laryngoscope*, LVII (January, 1947), 31-40.

"Since the hearing aid is a miniature communication system, similar to the telephone or interphone, the electrical and acoustical characteristics which determine its performance are those which are generally important in all communication systems." The writer discusses important characteristics of the hearing aid.

Orton, Henry Boylan, "A Review of the Available Literature on the Larynx and Laryngeal Surgery for 1946," *The Laryngoscope, LVII* (March, 1947), 161-200.

An extensive survey of the literature pertaining to the larynx and laryngeal surgery is presented.

Myklebust, Helmer R., "Research in the Education and Psychology of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing," *Journal of Educational Research*, XL (April, 1947), 598-605.

"Considerable factual evidence is available pertaining to the education and psychology of children with impaired hearing." Myklebust presents some of the research findings and needs relative to children who are auditorially handicapped.

PEACHER, WILLIAM G., "Speech Disorders in World War II: VII, Treatment of Dysarthria," *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, CVI (July, 1947), 66-76.

Peacher discusses the various types of language and voice disorders and their management as observed in the United States and British Armies during the war.

PFLAUM, GEORGE R. R., "Let them Speak!," *Kansas Teacher*, LV (April, 1947), 7ff.

"The effects of the war on the speech of the people are already being reflected in the speech correction clinics of the country." Believing that stuttering, lisping, and many other common forms of defective speech will be present among children born during the war years, the writer discusses the general question of the effects of the war on the speech of the younger generation.

PUGH, BESSIE, "Twentieth Century Trends in the Education of the Deaf," *The Volta Review*, XLIX (June, 1947), 261, 262ff.

In a discussion of trends in the education of the deaf, the writer concludes that the "progress made in the future will depend to a large extent upon the ever-increasing use of scientific experiments and applications of the findings to the classroom problems."

RATCLIFF, J. D., "Miracle with Mirrors," *Hygeia*, XXV (July, 1947), 532, 533.

"Speech is perhaps the most miraculous of human faculties. We hear, see and feel as part of our natural birthright. But everyone has to learn speech for himself—and one in twenty doesn't learn properly." Ratcliff discusses the use of mirrors in the correction of articulatory defects.

REAY, EDWARD W., "A Comparison between Deaf and Hearing Children in Regard to the Use of Verbs and Nouns in Compositions Describing a Short Motion Picture Story," *American Annals of the Deaf*, XCI (November, 1946), 453-491.

Reay presents results of an investigation designed to determine the retardation of deaf children and some qualitative differences between deaf and hearing children in the use of verbs and nouns when they are writing about the same limited subject.

REID, GLADYS, "A Preliminary Investigation in the Testing of Lip-Reading Achievement," *American Annals of the Deaf*, XCI (November, 1946), 403-413.

"The problem facing the lip-reading teacher today is lack of a standardized lip-reading achievement test. Reid presents a study designed to discover, if possible, whether or not lip-reading and the learning of lip-reading are phenomena which will lend themselves to standardized achievement testing.

RESNICK, MAX, "Selling a Hearing Aid is Not Enough," *The Volta Review*, XLIX (July, 1947), 311ff.

"The job of a hearing consultant is not merely selling a hearing aid. He must sell hearing itself and become responsible for the welfare of the user." The qualifications of consultants for hearing aid fittings are discussed.

ROBBINS, SAMUEL D., "Principles of Nomenclature and of Classification of Speech and Voice Disorders," *The Journal of Speech Disorders*, XII (March, 1947), 17-22.

"Before a systematic international classification of speech and voice disorders is undertaken, three important policies must be adopted: 1. It must be decided whether the classification is to be strictly causal, strictly descriptive, or a combination of both. 2. It must be agreed whether technical terms shall be monomial or binomial. 3. It must be determined whether technical terms shall be derived from the Greeks, from the Latin, or from both languages." Robbins compares classifications from other sciences, chiefly the botanical sciences.

ROSEN, SAMUEL, "Learning the Lempert Fenestration Operation," *Archives of Otolaryngology*, XLV (March, 1947), 335-338.

"Learning the technic of the Lempert fenestration operation is difficult because of at least two factors inherent in the procedure itself." Rosen presents a paper designed to give "specific clues which may help surgeons to train themselves to a maximum degree of technical efficiency."

SCHMIDEBERG, MELITTA, "Learning to Talk," *The Psychoanalytic Review*, XXXIV (July, 1947), 296-235.

"In addition to sexual and aggressive impulses, ego-libido plays an important part in our learning to talk and later on becomes partly displaced onto other sublimations." The writer discusses the "several interdependent processes" of learning to talk.

NEWS AND NOTES

OTA THOMAS, *Editor*

NEW APPOINTMENTS

Four new members were added to the Department of Speech and Dramatics at Stanford University this fall. They are Rebecca Grimes, assistant in costuming; Selma Chapmond, assistant in costuming; Alfred Larr, acting instructor in public speaking and speech correction; and George Nichols, acting instructor in theatre and drama.

• • •

Spencer F. Brown of the University of Minnesota has been appointed Associate Professor of Speech Pathology at the State University of Iowa.

John Colby Lewis and Harold Cleveland Crain have been appointed assistant professors of Dramatic Art. Mr. Lewis had been on the staff of Rhode Island State College.

New instructors in communication skills at Iowa include Fred Darley, Joseph Elfenbein, E. H. Sandefur, Don Ecroyd, and Grant Herbstruth. Two new instructors in speech are Curtis Pope and Charles Balcer.

• • •

William Wolf of the University of Iowa has been appointed Director of Speech and Education at the University of North Carolina in charge of speech correction.

• • •

The Department of Speech, Marietta College, announces the following appointments: Gersard Wilk, former director of Radio Station ROt-Weiss-Rot, Salzburg, Germany, and program director for the Office of War Information, Rome, Italy; Samuel Winters Ettelson, writer and author of screen plays *High, Wide and Handsome, Ever Since Eve, Crocus in the Valley* and others; and M. Charles Dun Leavay, radio and screen writer and winner of the Avery-Hopwood Award at the University of Michigan.

• • •

R. L. Benjamin has accepted an instructorship at the University of Hawaii for the year 1947-48.

• • •

William Buys has accepted a teaching position at the Wisconsin High School, University of Wisconsin.

Martin P. Anderson has resigned his position at the University of Wisconsin to accept a joint assistant professorship in speech and extension at the University of California at Los Angeles.

• • •

Wesley Egan has joined the theatre staff at Kent State University. Muriel Lewis, at Kent State, is now teaching interpretation and drama.

• • •

Fred Gerber is now instructor in radio at Indiana University.

• • •

Fred Alexander is now teaching at North Central College in Naperville, Illinois.

• • •

Preston Gledhill of the University of Wisconsin has accepted a position in the Department of Speech at Brigham Young University.

• • •

Hugh Rundell has accepted an instructorship in radio at the University of West Virginia.

• • •

Martin P. Cobin has been appointed Assistant Professor in the theatre division of the speech department at the University of West Virginia.

• • •

William Work, who was recently stage technician of the Kalamazoo Players and the Dorset Playhouse, will be a theatre assistant at the University of Wisconsin during 1947-48.

• • •

Charles Strother has resigned from the faculty of the State University of Iowa to accept a position at the University of Washington.

• • •

Lucy Barton joined the faculty of the Department of Drama at the University of Texas this fall. She will have complete charge of all costume design and courses.

• • •

Wayne Thompson, formerly on the speech staff at the University of Missouri and assistant to the Executive Secretary of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, has accepted an appointment as Head of Speech at the Undergraduate Division of the University of Illinois in Chicago.

Leland M. Griffin has resigned from the faculty at the University of Missouri to accept an instructorship at Cornell University.

• • •

Francine Merritt, of the University of Missouri, has been appointed instructor in speech at Louisiana State University.

• • •

The following appointments have been made at the University of Missouri for the academic year 1947-48: Robert Burrows, formerly of the University of North Carolina, to be Technical Director of the University of Missouri Theatre Workshop; Nelda Goode, assistant to the director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic; Anna Dean Ballew, assistant in radio; Elizabeth Harris, assistant in the theatre, William H. Perkins and James T. Hodges, instructors in speech.

• • •

The Department of Speech at the University of Indiana has made a number of new appointments. Edward Culbertson, formerly at Iowa State Teachers College, has been named to take charge of voice science with the rank of assistant professor. Philip Hood, from the University of Denver, has been appointed instructor. Gayle Wilson, former instructor in the School of Education at Indiana, has been transferred to the speech department.

• • •

M. B. Smith, formerly of Jamestown College, North Dakota, and Elaine McDavitt from Northern State Teachers College, Michigan, have joined the speech staff at Iowa State Teachers College.

• • •

Reginald Lawrence has been appointed Assistant Professor in the Department of Drama at the University of Southern California to teach courses in playwriting. He was formerly on the staff of Fordham University.

• • •

John W. Ackley, formerly of Whitman College and the University of Denver, has accepted an appointment on the staff of San Diego State College.

• • •

Bert Hensen, upon the termination of the three-year Montana study of the development methods in the application in sociodrama to therapy of rural communities, has accepted the position of Director of the Student Speech Bureau at the University of Denver. He is planning on applying sociodramatic methods to typical urban problems in the Denver community.

E. R. Nichols, Jr., formerly on the speech staff at the College of the Pacific and for the past five years in the Navy in intelligence work, has accepted an appointment to the faculty of the University of Oregon.

• • •

Another addition to the Oregon staff is D. Glenn Starlin, formerly of the University of Akron, and for the past four years an administrative officer in the United States Navy.

Harry Bach and John Baird have been appointed as instructors at Oregon.

• • •

Raymond L. Barnard of the University of Denver has been appointed Assistant Director of Speech in the College of Business Administration at the University of Denver.

• • •

Victor Powell, formerly of Dartmouth College, is the new forensics director at Wabash College.

• • •

Ernest H. Henrikson has resigned as Chairman of the Speech Division at the University of Colorado to accept a position in the speech clinic at the University of Minnesota.

• • •

New instructors who will teach the basic course at the University of Colorado are Marjorie Olson, Ann Martin, and A. Edward Lambert.

Richard A. Perry has been appointed to the staff at the University of Colorado as Assistant Professor of Speech. He will direct the Speech Clinic.

• • •

Beaumont Bruestle has resigned from the faculty at Temple Univeristy to accept an appointment at the University of Tulsa.

• • •

Wallace A. Bacon, formerly of the University of Michigan, has been appointed Chairman of the Department of Interpretation at the Northwestern School of Speech.

Charles F. Hunter has accepted an assistant professorship in radio at Northwestern. He leaves the University of Kanasas City.

Herbert Phillippi, appointed Assistant Professor of Dramatic Production, and Leo Doerfler, appointed Instructor in Audiology, also join the Northwestern staff. Mr. Phillippi was formerly at the University of Missouri and the Ohio State University.

• • •

New appointments to the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art at the University of Maryland are M. R. White from Wyoming University; W. L. Strausbaugh from Arizona

State College; Earl Mitchell from William and Mary; John Bettenbender from Catholic University; Eugene O'Sullivan from Catholic University; Elmer Barraclough from Beloit; Vesta White from North Carolina University; and Jean Hannon from Maryland University.

• • •

Mrs. Corinne Holt Rickert, new member of the radio department of the University of Miami, comes to the staff from the University of Minnesota. Mrs. Rickert has been on the staffs of KUOM and WCCO in Minneapolis.

• • •

Victor Michalak and his wife, Mrs. Virginia Glascow Michalak, have been appointed Instructors in Speech at Albion College. They come to Albion from Wayne University.

• • •

Jon Eisenson, who served as director of the Queens College Speech Clinic while on leave from Brooklyn College last year, has been appointed a permanent member of the faculty of Queens College.

Edward W. Borgers was appointed Lecturer and Lynne Rogers was appointed Fellow in the Department of Speech at Queens College.

• • •

New members of the speech staff at Purdue University beginning in September include Stanley K. Jamilton and Delmar E. Solem in dramatics; John T. Auston, Robert S. Cathcart in forensics; and Marcella Pepper in the speech clinic.

• • •

New appointments at Brooklyn College include Joanna Alogdelis, Ruth Klein, Mrs. Rosaline B. Zankel, and Pierce C. Ommanney. All are serving as substitutes.

Resignations from the faculty at Brooklyn College are Mildred Gottdank, who has accepted a position at Adelphi College; Georgia Bowman, who has taken a position at William Jewell College; and Asa J. Berlin, who has received a fellowship at Northwestern University.

• • •

Wesley Wiksell has accepted a position on the staff of the Department of Speech of Louisiana State University. Mr. Wiksell has for several years been a member of the faculty of Stephens College where he was in charge of the communications program of the college.

• • •

New staff members at the University of Washington include E. Thayen Curry, audiology; John Hoshor, fundamentals and rhetoric; Jack L. Banks, speech correction; Mrs. Sholie R. Brown, voice and interpretation; Elizabeth M., Jenks, fundamentals; Mrs. Helen Stolte Grayum, speech correction; Michael Hogan, radio speech; William R. Tiffany, speech correction; and James Shapley, speech laboratory.

• • •

The University of Illinois announces the following new appointments: as Professor of Speech and Drama, Barnard W. Hewitt, formerly of Brooklyn College, who will take up his duties in February; as Instructor in Speech, Roger Bernhardt, from the University of Wisconsin; as Assistants in Speech, Ernest Badenoch of Duke University, Nancy McKaig and Mrs. Marjorie Swanson of Northwestern University, and Sue Clark Amling, Marguerite Bard, Leroy C. Brown, Norma Del Diedrich, Jack J. Hasch, George A. Remington, and Genevieve Richardson, all of the University of Illinois.

• • •

PROFESSIONAL

The Eastern Public Speaking Campaign will hold its annual meeting at the Hotel New Yorker, April 16, 17, 1948.

• • •

Mrs. Edna Hill Young, the originator of the moto-kinaesthetic method of speech correction, has returned to Los Angeles from the University of Denver in order to live at a lower altitude. She will engage in private practice in Los Angeles, instructing teachers in the use of the moto-kinaesthetic method.

• • •

Clay Harshbarger of the Iowa speech department served as Administrator and Assistant Director of the Summer Session this year.

• • •

Gordon Minter returned to the Department of Drama at the University of Texas after a year's leave spent in studying television and directing the activities of the Westchester Playhouse in New York. Mr. Minter will serve as chairman of the department this year.

A feature of the tenth anniversary of the founding of the Department of Drama at the University of Texas will be an extensive "touring" program. A three-act play and several one-act plays will be presented to audiences in schools and cities of central Texas. The plays will be directed by F. Loren Winship who will be in charge of all companies which go on the road.

Constance Welsh of the Yale School of Drama was guest professor of acting in the Department of Drama at the University of Texas during the past summer.

E. P. Conkle, resident playwright at the University of Texas, was guest professor of playwriting at Banff School of Fine Arts the past summer.

During the past year Indiana University inaugurated a system of open forums, in which the students in public speaking classes participated. At each program, six speakers representing six different sections gave brief speeches. This was followed by a question-and-answer period. The forums have greatly stimulated interest in public speaking classes and proved a definite motivation for the discussion of current problems.

Indiana University has completed a new Studio Theatre which will be used exclusively for presenting new scripts and student-directed performances.

• • •

The New England Speech Association held its annual conference on November 28 and 29 at the Hotel Statler in Boston. The program gave special emphasis to the needs of the secondary and elementary teachers. A symposium of three speakers in the fields of education and the professions featured a general session on "The Challenge to Speech Education in New England."

• • •

The Department of English and Speech at Iowa State Teachers College has recently established a major in speech having four areas of emphasis: speech correction, discussion and debate, drama, and radio.

The Speech Clinic at Iowa State Teachers College sponsored a one-day Special Education Institute this summer in cooperation with the Iowa Society for Crippled Children and Adults. This fall the Clinic is offering for the fourth year an extension service in speech correction for the classroom teacher. This service is proved to county superintendents and emphasizes aid to one-room rural and small village schools. The work is closely coordinated with the State Special Education Program.

A Conference of Speech Education was held on October 4 at Iowa State Teachers College for the discussion of problems relating to the teaching of speech, speech correction, drama, discussion and debate.

• • •

Donald Harrington of the University of Washington taught in the Department of Drama at the University of Southern California during the Summer Post-Session.

• • •

Speakers Congress, student forensic organization at the University of Colorado, plans an expanded program this year both in membership and activities. Special activities will include a weekly roundtable discussion of current affairs over Station KBOL, a series of Town Meeting forums, and a debate with Oxford University on the campus in November.

• • •

At the annual meeting of the Georgia Speech Association, Mrs. W. W. Davison of the Davison School of Speech Correction in Atlanta was elected President.

• • •

A new Department of Radio, Speech, and Theatre has been established within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Temple University. The department is organized to integrate and coordinate the fields of radio, speech, theatre, and eventually television. Chairman of the Department is Armand L. Hunter, formerly Chairman of the Department of Radio of the School of Speech at Northwestern University.

Other members of the new department are Gordon Hostettler, supervisor of all debate and forensic activities; Joseph Zimmerman, head of the theatre division and director of the Television Workshop; David Kaplan and Irwin Brown, instructors in speech and radio; John Roberts, instructor in radio and director of WRTI, the radio division's "wired wireless" campus station; Mrs. Helen Bvse, instructor in speech who will supervise women's debate and forensic activities; Paul Randall, director of the theatre and Templayers; Clemen Peck, technical director for the theatre and Templayers; Miss Madge Skelly, director of Freshman Players; and Dave Davis, music director and production assistant for the Radio Workshop.

Four new studios and four control rooms with a music room and library and news room are being completed for the radio classes and Workshop. The studios are all RCA equipped and will serve to originate all programs broadcast over WFIL and WFIL-Fm, as well as to originate all programs broadcast over WRTI. Plans are under way to develop a Theatre and Television Workshop in order to provide a continuous series of programs, plays and television broadcasts in which the students can learn the methods and techniques involved in these three communicative arts and media. Special forensic activities are being arranged to include Freshman, Varsity, and Women's squads.

• • •

The first meeting of the newly-founded New York Society for Speech and Voice Therapy was held on October 8 in the Academy of Medicine. The Society has been organized to promulgate the most modern knowledge and to stimulate further studies concerning speech and voice disorders, their underlying causes as well as their treatment. The board of directors is

made up of experts in the field; eminent scientists from closely related fields will serve in an advisory capacity.

The Society will sponsor monthly lectures on subjects of scientific and practical interest in the field of speech and voice therapy. These lectures will be accompanied by demonstrations of clinical cases—a special feature which will enable therapists to raise controversial questions and bring forward new methods of treatment.

• • •

Carroll P. Lahman, the head of the speech department at Albion College, has resigned his position and moved to California because of his wife's poor health. James W. Brock has been named acting chairman of the department for the current year.

PERSONAL

On leave from Stanford University during the fall term were Virgil Anderson, to do writing; F. Cowles Strickland, to study motion pictures in Hollywood; Wendell Cole and Helene Blattner, to do graduate work; and Gordon Emerson.

• • •

N. Edd Miller, debate coach at the University of Texas, went on leave in September in order to continue his graduate studies.

• • •

Alta B. Hall is on sabbatical leave from the University of Southern California during the first semester of 1947-48. She is spending part of her time on a revision of the Hall and Sturgis *Textbook on Parliamentary Law*.

• • •

Armel Dyer, forensics director at Wabash College during 1946-47, resigned in order to reenter the army. He was given the rank of Lieutenant Colonel and is now serving overseas in the Pacific area.

• • •

Cameron W. Garbutt has resigned from the faculty of Cornell University in order to complete his graduate studies.

• • •

At the University of Washington Professor F. W. Orr has retired from the administrative duties of the Department of Speech. He began his work in 1925 with a staff which consisted of an instructor and two teaching fellows, and offered a few courses in public speaking and argument. He relinquished the leadership last July with an independent department offering a major for the B. A. and M. A. degrees, and a minor for the doctorate in speech, and having a faculty of twenty-two members. His work has been notable especially for the development of problem-solving discussion and courses in voice training for speech. The new Executive Officer of the department is Horace G. Rahskopf, who has been a member of the staff since 1928.

• • •

Wade Kniseley and Mrs. Geneva Gormley are on leave this year from the University of Washington in order to do graduate work.

• • •

Cole S. Brembeck is on leave from Manchester College in order to work on his doctorate.

• • •

Northeastern University's speech activity includes, besides the usual curricula courses, the Bureau of Business and Industrial Service. Sponsored by the Evening Division, BOBIS offers a compact program of courses in public speaking and supervisory training with classes held at plants and places of business. Bethlehem Steel, Liggett's, and Gillette Safety Razor Company are outstanding among local and national subscribers to the program. Development of the service is under the leadership of Thomas Cooper, Jr.

THEATRE

The Indiana University Theatre, in cooperation with the National Thespian Society, sponsored the second National Drama Conference on the campus from June 16-21. Approximately 1,000 directors and students from university, college, and high school dramatic groups from some thirty-five states were in attendance. It was the largest drama conference of its kind ever held in the United States.

The following plays were presented: *Miss Lulu Bett* by Berea College; *The Desert*, by Charleston, West Virginia, High School; *The Spider's Web*, by Webster Groves, Missouri, High School; *The Great American Family*, by Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute; *Married at Sunrise*, by Clayton, Missouri, High School; *Wampum*, by Benton Harbor, Michigan, High School; *The Emperor's New Clothes*, by Children's Division of the Indianapolis Civic Theatre; *The Last of the Lowries*, by Newport News, Virginia, High School; *A Well-Remembered Voice*, by Revere, Massachusetts, High School; *The Rivals*, by Indiana University; and *The Squire's Bride*, by Champaign, Illinois, High School.

A special NBC network program by a cast selected by Charles Lammers, Dramatic Director for WLW, was presented on June 21. The entire broadcast was under the direction of personnel sent to the campus by Station WLW.

In addition to the various performances, addresses were given by Dr. Solomón V. Arnaldo, Deputy Resident Observer for UNESCO to the United Nations, who spoke on "UNESCO as it

relates to the dramatic arts"; Brock Pemberton, Broadway producer, who spoke on "What Is Good Theatre?"; and C. L. Menser, Vice-President in charge of Programs, National Broadcasting Company, who spoke on "Potentialities of Radio Drama."

Running concurrently with the National Drama Conference was a conference of the Children's Theatre. One hundred sixty-five representatives from many different sections attended. It was sponsored by the American Educational Theatre Association in cooperation with Indiana University.

• • •

During the past summer the National Theatre Conference launched its Tryout Studio in New York. The project was housed in the Hunter College Playhouse and was under the direction of Mary Morris. Tryouts were held in June and a carefully selected group of twenty-five young actors were chosen to participate. All were graduates of the various college and professional drama schools and community theatres belonging to the National Theatre Conference.

The purpose of this NTC project is to afford some kind of bridge between the colleges and schools and those who have in their hands the employing of promising young actors. The NTC Tryout Studio in New York is to be an annual project, and it is hoped it will lead to employment for much young talent which so often goes unknown and wasted. It will fill a long-felt need both for managers and directors as well as for the gifted young people.

This summer the activities culminated in the production of five plays between September 2-9. Each was presented twice to good audiences. The plays were: *Hotel Universe*, directed by Edward Greer; *No Exit*, directed by Joanna Roos; *Liliom*, directed by Mary Morris; *Music at Night*, directed by Edward Greer; *Daughters of Atreus*, directed by Mary Morris.

• • •

Indiana University Theatre has been selected as headquarters for the National Theatre Conference Touring Company. The first production will be Somerset Maugham's *The Sacred Flame*, which will be toured throughout the Central States, appearing in community and university theatres. Indiana University Theatre will present next season the following list of plays: *Boy Meets Girl, The Sacred Flame, Apple of His Eye, Joan of Lorraine, Morning's at Seven, Jordan River Revue* (student musical), *The Barrets of Wimpole Street*, and the *Skylark*.

• • •

The Stanford Players have scheduled for production this year *Richard III, Cyrano*, and in cooperation with the music department the English opera, *Peter Grimes* by Benjamin Bretton. There will be a number of productions in the Studio Theatre as well.

• • •

The Experimental Theatre at the University of Southern California, under the supervision of James H. Butler, produced 21 one-act plays last season. In this group, four were original and one was a new translation of a Strindberg play. All were student directed.

The University of Southern California Department of Drama last season produced five major three-act plays: *Arms and the Man, Heaven Can Wait, Dear Ruth, Joan of Lorraine*, and *The Late George Apley*. In addition, it cooperated with the music department in producing a student written and directed musical comedy entitled "G.I. Bill."

• • •

The theatre division at Temple University produced three plays last year under the direction of Paul Randall: *The Great Big Doorstep, The Gentle People*, and *Arsenic and Old Lace*. Nine plays were produced by Miss Madge Skelly and the Freshman Players, including a unique presentational staging of *Romeo and Juliet* in the great court of the Student Union Building. Clemen Peck served as designer and technical director for all productions.

• • •

As its fall production, the Queens College Playshop sponsored by Mrs. Elizabeth G. Scanlan, will present *Blind Alley* by James Warwick. It will be produced at the Childrens' Center Theatre in New York City on December 19 and 20. Lucille G. Steain will direct.

• • •

The Illini Theatre Guild at the University of Illinois will present the following productions on its major series program for the 1947-48 season. *All The King's Men* by R. P. Warren; John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* and Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*, both to be produced on the Guild's replica of the Old Globe stage; *Anna Sophie Hedvig* by Kjeld Abell; Anton Chekov's *The Cherry Orchard*; Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion*.

• • •

Additional productions produced by the Illini Theatre Guild's Laboratory Theatre will provide for experimentation in unusual forms of playwrighting and staging including the production of plays from a group of undergraduate playwrights who are working under the Guild's sponsorship.

The Illini Theatre Guild's staff this year is composed of Wesley Swanson, Supervising Di-

rector; Charles Shattuck, Associate Director; Lucilla Hall, Laboratory Theatre Director; Joseph Scott, Technical Director; Genevieve Richardson, Assistant Technical Director in charge of costumes and make-up; Henry Mamet, Director of Public Relations; Jay Allen, Opera Director.

• • •

PROMOTIONS

Walter Emery, who, since leaving the Department of Speech at Ohio State University for service with the Federal Communications Commission, has recently been promoted and named Chief of the Renewals and Revocations Section.

• • •

Gladys Borchers has been promoted to a full professorship at the University of Wisconsin.

• • •

James Moll was promoted to Assistant Professor of Drama at the University of Texas this summer; and Shirlee Dodge, instructor in dance drama, was promoted to Assistant Professor.

• • •

Grant Fairbanks has been promoted from the rank of Associate Professor to Professor of Speech at the University of Southern California.

Milton C. Dickens has been promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Southern California.

• • •

Charles K. Thomas has been promoted to the rank of Professor at Cornell; he continues in charge of the Speech Clinic.

• • •

Gordon Hostettler was promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor at Temple University.

• • •

The School of Speech at Northwestern University has promoted Raymond T. Carhart to Professor of Audiology; Donley F. Feddersen to Assistant Professor of Radio; Theodore Fuchs to Professor of Dramatic Production; Charlotte Lee to Assistant Professor of Interpretation; Irving J. Lee to Associate Professor of Public Speaking; Lee Mitchell to Associate Professor of Dramatic Production; Karl F. Robinson to Associate Professor of Speech Education; and Harold Westlake to Associate Professor of Audiology.

• • •

Beatrice F. Jacoby and Wilbert L. Pronovost were promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor in the speech department at Queens College.

Promotions at the University of Illinois include W. M. Parrish, from Associate Professor to Professor; Marie Hochmuth, from Instructor to Assistant Professor; William W. Adams, Ida Levison, and Otis M. Walter, from Assistant to Instructor.

• • •

DEATHS

Victor Alvin Ketcham, professor of Speech at the Ohio State University for thirty-four years, died on July 20 at Mt. Carmel Hospital, in Columbus, after two and a half-year's illness. He was 63 years old.

Professor Ketcham was born in Corning, Ohio. He attended the Ohio University prior to entering the Ohio State University, where he received his A.B. degree in 1907. He went on to receive his LL.B. degree at the Ohio State University Law School in 1910.

Early in his career Professor Ketcham turned from the practice of law to the teaching of Speech. He taught at the University of Maine from 1910 to 1912, and at the University of Illinois from 1912 to 1913, before becoming associated with the Ohio State University as a staff member in 1913.

Professor Ketcham served for three decades as director of Public Speaking and Debate courses and activities at Ohio State. In 1936, he was made Chairman of the newly created Department of Speech. His own indefatigable labor in bringing the new department into being was recogized by his associates.

In the late 29's and early 30's Professor Ketcham spent much of his time giving lectures to classes of the personal heads of several large corporations, including RCA and General Electric. In this work he was highly successful.

Among the works of Professor Ketcham were *Argumentation and Debate* (1914) and *Make a Good Speech* (1944). The latter is now in mimeograph form and will be published soon. His lecture, "The Seven Doors to the Mind," has been printed in several textbooks on public speaking as illustrative of the imaginative elements in speech making.

Professor Ketcham was a member of the American Association of University Professors, the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, the Ohio Society of New York, Delta Sigma Rho, the Lions Club at New Lexington, Ohio, and the Faculty Club.

EARL W. WILEY,
Ohio State University

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

1915 1947

Volumes I-III, The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking
Volumes IV-XIII, The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education
Volumes XIV-XXXIII, The Quarterly Journal of Speech

Published by
THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
(formerly The National Association of Teachers of Speech)
Loren D. Reid, Executive Secretary, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

EDITOR
KARL R. WALLACE
134 Lincoln Hall, University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
In Charge of Departments

DONALD C. BRYANT, *Washington University* (St. Louis) ..... Rhetoric and Public Speaking
H. D. ALBRIGHT, *Cornell University* ..... Drama and the Theatre
D. W. MORRIS, *Ohio State University* ..... Speech Correction
WILBUR E. GILMAN, *Queens College* ..... Oral Interpretation
FOREST L. WHAN, *University of Wichita* ..... Radio
KARL F. ROBINSON, *Northwestern Univrsity* ..... Secondary Schools
HOWARD GILKINSON, *University of Minnesota* ..... New Books
MARIE K. HOCHMUTH, *University of Illinois* ..... In the Periodicals
OTA THOMAS REYNOLDS, *Hunter College* ..... News and Notes

Jeanette O. Anderson, Rockford College; Virgil A. Anderson, Stanford University; Dallas C. Dickey, University of Florida; Kenneth G. Hance, Northwestern University; Barnard W. Hewitt, Brooklyn College; Glen E. Mills, Northwestern University; Virginia S. Sanderson, Ohio State University; Arthur E. Secord, Brooklyn College; John C. Snidecor, University of California (Santa Barbara)

Subscriptions should be addressed to THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

Contributions to any of the various departments should be addressed to the appropriate Associate Editor.

Manuscripts of articles and correspondence concerning them should be addressed to the Editor, 134 Lincoln Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the instructions printed in the February, 1945, issue; copies of these instructions may be obtained from the Editor.

Contributors desiring reprints of articles appearing in the JOURNAL should communicate with the Artcraft Press, Columbia, Missouri, not less than fifteen days before the date of issue.

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH is published in the months of February, April, October, and December, by the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

Entered as second class matter at the post office at Columbia, Missouri, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Subscription price $3.50 a year. Single copies of current issue $1.00. All remittances should be payable to THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH.

Index and Title Page for the volume is bound in each December JOURNAL.

A Table of Contents of all back issues of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH and SPEECH MONOGRAPHS is available at 25c per copy. Address the Executive Secretary, University of Missouri.

Copyright 1947 by the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIII

Abney, Louise (Rev.) *Sleeping Beauty* (Agnes Curran Hamm), 537.

Allen, Harold B. (Rev.) *Speech Development of a Bilingual Child: Vol. II. Sound-Learning in the First Two Years* (Werner F. Leopold), 394.

Altick, Richard D.: *Preface to Critical Reading.* Rev. by Elbert W. Harrington, 247.

Aly, Bower (Rev.) *Alexander Hamilton* (Nathan Schachner), 101.

Anderson, Jeanette: But *Is* It Aphasia? 496.

One Ear to the Ground, 207.

The State of Speech Correction, 69.

Arnold, Carroll C.: The Speech Style of Benjamin Disraeli, 427.

Auer, J. Jeffery: Tom Corwin: "Men Will Remember Me as a Joker!" 9.

Auer, J. Jeffery, and Henry Lee Ewbank: *Handbook for Discussion Leaders.* Rev. by Leroy T. Laase, 527.

Bagwell, Paul D. (Rev.) *Problems and Styles of Communication* (Wilbur Samuel Howell), 237.

Baird, A. Craig (Rev.) *Four Who Spoke Out* (Robert T. Oliver), 526

Baird, A. Craig, and Lester Thonssen: Methodology in the Criticism of Public Address, 134.

Barnard, Raymond H. (Rev.) *The Process of Persuasion* (Clyde R. Miller), 242.

Barnes, Grace: *General American Speech Sounds.* Rev. by C. K. Thomas, 392.

Bauer, Marvin G. (Rev.) *The New Training for Effective Speech* (Robert T. Oliver, Ruperet L. Cortright, and Cyril F. Hager), 389.

Berman, Eleanor Davidson, and C. E. McClintock, Jr.: Thomas Jefferson and Rhetoric, 1.

Berry, Mildred Freburg (Rev.) *Basic Training in Speech* (Lester Thonssen and Howard Gilkinson), 523.

(Rev.) *Speaking in Public* (Wayland Maxfield Parrish), 387.

Biggar, George C.: What the Radio Station Manager Expects of the College, 196.

Black, John W. (Rev.) *The Bases of Phonology* (R. H. Stetson), 241.

(Rev.) *Remembrance of Amherst. An Undergraduate's Diary 1846-1847 (William Gardiner Hammond).* (George F. Whicher, ed.), 539.

Blackburn, Mary: The Speech Teacher and the High School Assembly Program, 80.

Bohman, George V. (Rev.) *Fundamentals of Public Speaking* (Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace), 389.

Boomsliter, Paul C. (Rev.) *First Steps in Acting* (Samuel Selden), 396.

Borchers, Gladys and Claude M. Wise: *Modern Speech.* Rev. by Margaret Robb, 385.

Boulware, Marcus H.: Speech Training in Negro Colleges, 509.

Boyle, Roger: Original Plays in the College Theatre, 485.

Braden, Waldo W.: The Bases of William E. Borah's Speech Preparation, 28.

Brang, C. Cordelia, and Karl F. Robinson: Some Suggested Units on Voice and Articulation for Secondary Schools, 92.

Bricland, Don M. (Rev.) *Are You Telling Them?* (Bess Sondel), 530.

Brigance, W. Norwood, 1946: Year of Decision, 127.

Brigance, William Norwood: *Speech Communication: A Brief Textbook.* Rev. by Clyde W. Dow, 523.

Brigance, W. Norwood, and Wilhelmina Hedde: *American Speech.* Revised edition. Rev. by Karl F. Robinson, 532.

Brin, Joseph G.: *Speech and Human Relations.* Rev. by Clarice Tatman, 390.

Bryant, Donald C., and Karl R. Wallace: *Fundamentals of Public Speaking.* Rev. by George V. Bohman, 389.

Byers, Burton H.: Regional Speech Differences in Veterans and Nonveterans, 312.

Butler, Jessie Haver: *Time to Speak Up.* Rev. by Melba Hurd Duncan, 244.

Callaghan, J. Calvin (Rev.) *The Church Across the Street* and *A Guide for Teachers Using The Church Across the Street* (Reginald D. Manwell and Sophia Lyons Fahs), 528.

Clark, Robert D.: Lesson in Persuasion, 265.

Clark, William Smith, II, Ed.: *Chief Patterns of World Drama.* Rev. by John Dolman, Jr., 243.

COMMUNICATION

Communication Center. Earl Wynn, 366.

Contributions From the Military Programs in Voice Communications. William B. McCoard, 370.

Education of the Elementary School Teacher in Communication Skills. Marion Emory Shea, 222.

Literature as an Enterprise in Communication. Wilbur Samuel Howell, 417.

Speech in a Communication Course. Glen E. Mills, 40.

Speech Training Program for Navy Fighter Directors. E. Thayer Curry, 209.

Cone, Carl B.: Major Factors in the Rhetoric of Historians, 437.

Constans, H. P. (Rev.) *Basic Principles of Speech.* Revised edition. (Lew Sarett and William Trufant Foster), 524.

Cortright, Rupert L., Robert T. Oliver, and Cyril F. Hager: *The New Training for Effective Speech.* Rev. by Marvin G. Bauer, 389.

Crafton, Allen: Objectives in Educational Drama, 336.

Crandell, S. Judson: The Beginnings of a Methodology for Social Control Studies in Public Address, 36.

Crews, Albert: *Professional Radio Writing.* Rev. by F. L. Whan, 245.

Crocker, Lionel, and Louis M. Eich: *Oral Reading.* Rev. by Margaret Robb, 529.

Curvin, Jonathan W.: Regional Drama in Our World, 480.

Curry, E. Thayer: The Speech Training Program for Navy Fighter Directors, 209.

DEBATE

Discussion and Democracy. Milton Dickens, 151.

On International Debating. Brooks Quimby, 159.

Desfousses, Beatrice: *Your Voice and Your Speech: Self-Training for Better Speaking.* Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam, 537.

Dickens, Milton: Discussion and Democracy, 151.

Dickey, Dallas C.: Southern Oratory: A Field for Research, 458.

Dickey, Dallas C. (Rev.) *Southern Oratory: A Study in Idealism* (Francis Pendleton Gaines), 391.

Dietrich, John E. (Rev.) *The Art of Play Production.* Revised Edition (John Dolman, Jr.), 385.

DISCUSSION
Discussion and Democracy. Milton Dickens, 151.
Goals, Obstacles, and Problem Formulation in Group Discussion. John W. Keltner, 468.
Dolman, John Jr.: *The Art of Play Production.* Revised edition. Rev. by John E. Dietrich, 385.
Dolman, John, Jr. (Rev.) *Chief Patterns of World Drama* (William Smith Clark, II, Ed.), 243.
Donner, Stanley T.: Mark Twain as a Reader, 308.
Donner, Stanley T., and Karl F. Robinson: Suggested Units in Radio for the Secondary School, 225.
Dow, Clyde W. (Rev.) *Speech Communication: A Brief Textbook* (William Norwood Brigance), 523.
Downer, Alan S.: Macready's Production of *Macbeth*, 172.
DRAMA AND THE THEATRE
"A Tale of the Bittter Root": Pageantry as Sociodrama. Bert B. Hansen, 162.
Backgrounds of Naturalism in the Theatre. Paul L. Soper, 46.
Did Shakespeare Anticipate Comments From His Audience? William Bryan Gates, 348.
Dramatic Ritual as Observed in the Sun Dance. Vio Mae Powell, 167.
George S. Kaufman Plays as Social History. Russell W. Lembke, 341.
Julius Bab's First Critique of the Theatre—III. Lisa Rauschenbusch, 53.
Macready's Production of *Macbeth*. Alan S. Downer, 172.
Objectives in Educational Drama. Allen Crafton, 336.
Original Plays in the College Theatre. Roger Boyle, 485.
Regional Drama in One World. Jonathan W. Curvin, 480.
DRAMATICS
Objectives in Educational Drama. Allen Crafton, 336.
Original Plays in the College Theatre. Roger Boyle, 485.
Suggestions for the High School Assembly. Theodore Skinner, 515.
Duncan, Melba Hurd (Rev.) *Time To Speak Up* (Jessie Haver Butler), 224.
Dunham, Barrows: *Man Against Myth.* Rev. by Irwin Lee Glatstein, 538.
Dusenbury, Delwin B. (Rev.) *Radio Drama Production* (Walter Krulevitch and Rome C. Krulevitch), 99.

Edwards, Davis: The Real Source of Vachel Lindsay's Poetic Technique, 182.
Ehrensberger, Ray, and Elaine Pagel: *Notebook for Public Speaking: A College Course in Basic Principles.* Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam, 525.
Ehrsam, Theodore G. (Rev.) *Jarrold's Dictionary of Difficult Words* (Robert H. Hill), 237.
(Rev.) *Notebook for Public Speaking: A College Course in Basic Principles* (Ray Ehrensberger and Elaine Pagel), 525.
(Rev.) *You Can Talk Well* (Richard Reager), 100.
(Rev.) *Your Voice and Your Speech. Self-Training for Better Speaking.* (Beatrice Desfousses), 537.
Eich, Louis M., and Lionel Crocker: *Oral Reading.* Rev. by Margaret Robb, 529.
Erekson, Reid B. (Rev.) *The History of the Seattle Stock Companies from Their Beginnings to 1934* (Mary Katherine Rohrer), 103.
Ewbank, Henry Lee, and J. Jeffery Auer: *Handbook for Discussion Leaders.* Rev. by Leroy T. Laase, 527.

Fahs, Sophia Lyons, and Reginald D. Manwell: *The Church Across the Street* and *A Guide for Teachers Using The Church Across the Street.* Rev. by J. Calvin Callaghan, 528.
Fields, Victor Alexander: *Training the Singing Voice.* Rev. by Giles Wilkeson Gray, 536.
Finlan, Leonard: The Relation Between Training and Teaching Activities of College Teachers of Speech, 72.
FORUM
Convention Headquarters for 1947 and 1948, 230.
Minutes of the Thirty-first Annual Conference Speech Association of America, 230.
Program of Annual Convention, 378.
Report of the Executive Secretary, 377.
Report of the Nominating Committee, 229.
Toward the History of Speech Education. Giles Wilkeson Gray, 521.
Freed, Conrad W.: Spengler on Language—Implications for Teachers, 31.
Fries, Charles C.: Implications of Modern Linguistic Science, 321.
Foster, William Trufant: Random Notes on Public Speaking, 139.
Foster, William Trufant, and Lew Sarett: *Basic Principles of Speech.* Revised edition. Rev. by H. P. Constans, 524.

Gaines, Francis Pendleton: *Southern Oratory: A Study in Idealism.* Rev. by Dallas C. Dickey, 391.
Gates, William Bryan: Did Shakespeare Anticipate Comments From His Audience? 348.
Gilkinson, Howard, and Lester Thonssen: *Basic Training in Speech.* Rev. by Mildred Freburg Berry, 523.
Glatstein, Irwin Lee (Rev.) *Man Against Myth* (Barrows Dunham), 538.
Gottdank, Mildred, and Doris Trepel: A Study of Encephalitics, 355.
Gray, Giles Wilkeson (Rev.) *The Intonation of American English* (Kenneth L. Pike), 242.
(Rev.) *Training the Singing Voice* (Victor Alexander Gray), 536.
Green, Harriet C., Ralph K. Potter, and George A. Kopp: *Visible Speech.* Rev. by Paul Moore, 534.
Griffin, Leland M.: Letter to the Press: 1778, 148.
Gulley, Halbert E.: Churchill's Speech on the Munich Agreement, 284.

Haberman, Frederick W.: John Thelwall: His Life, His School, and His Theory of Elocution, 292.
Hager, Cyril F., Robert T. Oliver, and Rupert L. Cortright: *The New Training for Effective Speech.* Rev. by Marvin G. Bauer, 389.
Hamm, Agnes Curran: *Sleeping Beauty.* Rev. by Louise Abney, 537.
Hance, Kenneth G. (Rev.) *Ethics and Language* (Charles L. Stevenson), 246.
Hansen, Bert B.: "A Tale of the Bitter Root": Pageantry as Sociodrama, 162.
Harrington, Elbert W. (Rev.) *Now You're Talking* (Harrison M. Karr), 98.

Speaking in Public (Wayland Maxfield Parrish). Rev. by Mildred F. Berry, 387.
Speech and Human Relations (Joseph G. Brin). Rev. by Clarice Tatman, 390.
Speech Communication: A Brief Textbook (William Norwood Brigance). (Rev. by Clyde W. Dow, 523.
Speech Correction: Principles and Methods (C. Van Riper). Rev. by Leon Lassers, 535.
Speech Development of a Bilingual Child: Vol. II. Sound-Learning in the First Two Years (Werner F. Leopold). Rev. by Harold B. Allen, 394.
Speech for the Classroom Teacher. Revised edition. (Dorothy I. Mulgrave). Rev. by F. Lincoln D. Holmes, 531.
Time To Speak Up (Jessie Haver Butler). Rev. by Melba Hurd Duncan, 244.
Training the Singing Voice (Victor Alexander Fields). Rev. by Giles Wilkeson Gray, 536.
Visible Speech (Ralph K. Potter, George A. Kopp, and Harriet C. Green). Rev. by Paul Moore, 534.
You Can Talk Well (Richard Reager). Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam, 100.
Your Voice and Your Speech: Self-Training for Better Speaking (Beatrice Desfousses). Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam, 537.
Nichols, Ralph G.: Listening: Questions and Problems, 83.
Nichols, Ralph G. (Rev.) *Extemporaneous Speaking* (J. M. O'Neill), 388.

Oliver, Robert T.: *Four Who Spoke Out.* Rev. by A. Craig Baird, 526.
Oliver, Robert T. (Rev.) *Mass Persuasion: The Psychology of a War Bond Drive* (Robert E. Merton, assisted by Marjorie Fiske and Alberta Curtis), 526.
Oliver, Robert T., Rupert L. Cortright, and Cyril F. Hager: *The New Training for Effective Speech.* Rev. by Marvin G. Bauer, 389.
O'Neill, J. M.: *Extemporaneous Speaking.* Rev. by Ralph G. Nichols, 388.

Pagel, Elaine, and Ray Ehrensberger: *Notebook for Public Speaking: A College Course in Basic Principles.* Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam, 525.
Parks, Brother E. Patrick, F. S. C.: *The Roman Rhetorical Schools as a Prepration for the Courts under the Early Empire.* Rev. by H. A. Wichelns, 239.
Parrish, W. M.: The Tradition of Rhetoric, 464.
Parrish, Wayland Maxfield: *Speaking in Public.* Rev. by Mildred F. Berry, 387.
Pastuhov, Vladimir D.: *A Guide to the Practice of International Conferences.* Rev. by Lester Thonssen, 102.
PHONETICS
Place of New York City in American Linguistic Geography. C. K. Thomas, 314.
Phonetics, Phonemics, and Teachers of Speech. Lee S. Hultzén, 202.
Regional Speech Differences in Veterans and Nonveterans. Burton H. Byers, 312.
Pike, Kenneth L.: *The Intonation of American English.* Rev. by Giles Wilkeson Gray, 242
Potter, Ralph K., George A. Kopp, and Harriet C. Green: *Visible Speech.* Rev. by Paul Moore, 534.
Powell, Vio Mae: Dramatic Ritual as Observed in the Sun Dance, 167.
PUBLIC ADDRESS
Bases of William E. Borah's Speech Preparation. Waldo W. Braden, 28.
Beginnings of a Methodology for Social Control Studies in Public Address. S. Judson Crandell,
Churchill's Speech on the Munich Agreement. Halbert E. Gulley, 284.
Contemporary Public Address as a Research Area. Wayne N. Thompson, 274.
Lesson in Persuasion. Robert D. Clark, 265.
Methodology in the Criticism of Public Address. A Craig Baird and Lester Thonssen, 134.
Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History. Ernest J. Wrage, 451.
Random Notes on Public Speaking. William Trufant Foster, 139.
Sheridan's Speech on Mrs. Fitzherbert. Loren D. Reid, 15.
Speech Style of Benjamin Disraeli. Carroll C. Arnold, 427.
Southern Oratory: A Field for Research. Dallas C. Dickey, 458.
Tom Corwin: Men Will Remember Me as a Joker! J. Jeffery Auer, 9.

Quimby, Brooks: On International Debating, 159.
Quiros, Aurora M.: English as a Foreign Language: A Challenge to the Speech Field, 501.

RADIO
Communication Center. Earl Wynn, 366.
Radio and International Understanding. F. W. Ziebarth, 328.
Radio Station Manager to Teachers of Radio. John W. Tinnea, 334.
Suggested Units in Radio for the Secondary School. Karl F. Robinson and Stanley T. Donner, 225.
What the Radio Station Manager Expects of the College. George C. Biggar, 196.
Rauschenbusch, Lisa: Julius Bab's First Critique of the Theatre—III, 53.
Reager, Richard: *You Can Talk Well.* Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam, 100.
Reid, Loren D.: Sheridan's Speech on Mrs. Fitzherbert, 15.
Reid, Melba: Speech in an Orientation Course for the Ninth Grade, 87.
Rice, George P., Jr.: Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as an Undergraduate Textbook, 217.
Robb, Margaret (Rev.) *Modern Speech* (Gladys Borchers and Claude M. Wise), 385.
(Rev.) *Oral Reading* (Lionel Crocker and Louis M. Eich), 529.
Robinson, Karl F. (Rev.) *American Speech.* Revised edition. (Wilhelmina Hedde and W. Norwood Brigance), 532.
Robinson, Karl F., and C. Cordelia Brang: Some Suggested Units on Voice and Articulation for Secondary Schools, 92.
Robinson, Karl F., and Stanley T. Donner: Suggested Units in Radio for the Secondary School, 225.
Rohrer, Mary Katherine: *The History of the Seattle Stock Companies from Their Beginnings to 1934.* Rev. by Reid B. Erekson, 103.

Sarett, Lew, and William Trufant Foster: *Basic Principles of Speech.* Revised edition. Rev. by H. P. Constans, 524.

Schachner, Nathan: *Alexander Hamilton*. Rev. by Bower Aly, 101.
Selden, Samuel: *First Steps in Acting*. Rev. by Paul C. Boomsliter, 396.
Selden, Samuel, Hubert C. Heffner and Hunton D. Sellman: *Modern Theatre Practice*. Rev. by C. R. Kase, 393.
Sellman, Hunton D., Hubert C. Heffner, and Samuel Selden: *Modern Theatre Practice*. Rev. by C. R. Kase, 393.
SEMANTICS
Spengler on Language—Implications for Teachers. Conrad W. Feed, 31.
Shea, Marion Emory: Education of the Elementary School Teacher in Communication Skills, 222.
Skinner, Theodore: Suggestions for the High School Assembly, 515.
Snidecor, John C.: Why the Indian Does Not Stutter, 493.
Sondel, Bess: *Are You Telling Them?* Rev. by Don M. Brieland, 530.
Soper, Paul L.: Backgrounds of Naturalism in the Theatre, 46.

Wallace, Karl R., and Donald C. Bryant: *Fundamentals of Public Speaking*. Rev. by George V. Bohman, 389.
Waller, Judith C.: Radio, *The Fifth Estate*. Rev. by F. L. Whan, 100.
Whan, F. L. (Rev.) *Professional Radio Writing* (Albert Crews), 245.
(Rev.) Radio, *The Fifth Estate* (Judith C. Waller), 100.
Whicher, George F., Ed.: *Remembrance of Amherst. An Undergraduate's Diary 1846-1847 (William Gardiner Hammond)*. Rev. by John W. Black, 539.
Wichelns, H. A. (Rev.) *The Roman Rhetorical Schools as a Preparation for the Courts Under the Early Empire* (Brother E. Patrick Parks, F. S. C.), 239.
Wise, Claude M., and Gladys Borchers: *Modern Speech*. Rev. by Margaret Robb, 385.
Wrage, Ernest J.: Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History, 451.
Wynn, Earl: A Communication Center, 366.

Ziebarth, E. W.: Radio and International Understanding, 328.

SPEECH CORRECTION
But *Is* It Aphasia? Jeanette Anderson, 496.
English As a Foregin Language: A Challenge to the Speech Field. Aurora M. Quiros, 501.
New State Program of Speech Re-education in Virginia. James M. Mullendore, 361.
One Ear to the Ground. Jeanette Anderson, 207.
Serviceable Speech in a Democracy. William J. Temple, 489.
State of Speech Correction. Jeanette Anderson, 69.
Study of Encephalitics. Mildred Gottdank and Doris Trepel, 355.
Why the Indian Does Not Stutter. John C. Snidecor, 493.
SPEECH EDUCATION
Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as an Undergraduate Textbook. George P. Rice, Jr.
Contributions From the Military Programs in Voice Communication. William B. McCoard, 370.
Education of the Elementary School Teacher in Communication Skills. Marion Emory Shea, 222.
Listening: Question and Problems. Ralph G. Nichols, 83.
New State Program of Speech Re-education in Virginia. James M. Mullendore, 361.
Objectives in Educational Drama. Allen Crafton, 336.
One Ear to the Ground. Jeanette Anderson, 207.
Oregon's Speech Improvement and Rehabilitation Program. Leon Lassers, 61.
Phonetics, Phonemics, and Teachers of Speech. Lee S. Hultzén, 202.
Radio Station Manager to Teachers of Radio. John W. Tinnea, 334.
Re-evaluation of Speech Objectives. Herold Lillywhite, 505.
Relation Between Training and Teaching Activities of College Teachers of Speech. Leonard Finlan, 72.
Serviceable Speech in a Democracy. William J. Temple, 489.
Some Suggested Units on Voice and Articulation for Secondary Schools. Karl F. Robinson and C. Cordelia Brang, 92.
Speech in an Orientation Course for the Ninth Grade. Melba Reid, 87.
Speech Teacher and the High School Assembly Program. Mary Blackburn, 80.
Speech Training in Negro Colleges. Marcus H. Boulware, 509.
Speech Training Program for Navy Fighter Directors. E. Thayer Curry, 209.
State of Speech Correction. Jeanette Anderson, 69.
Suggested Units in Radio for the Secondary School. Karl F. Robinson and Stanley T. Donner, 225.
Suggestions for the High School Assembly. Theodore Skinner, 515.
Training School Personnel in the Use of Recorders. Charles V. Kettering, 213.
Veteran Evaluates A Speech Course. Howard W. Townsend, 220.
What the Radio Station Manager Expects of the College. George C. Biggar, 196.
1946: Year of Decision. W. Norwood Brigance, 127.
SPEECH IN THE ARMED SERVICES
Contributions From the Military Programs in Voice Communications. William B. McCoard, 370.
Speech Training Program for Navy Fighter Directors. E. Thayer Curry, 209.
SPEECH PATHOLOGY (see SPEECH CORRECTION)
State and Regional Associations, 121.
Stetson, R. H.: *The Bases of Phonology*. Rev. by John W. Black, 241.
Stevenson, Charles L.: *Ethics and Language*. Rev. by Kenneth G. Hance, 246.
Still, Alfred: *Communication Through the Ages*. Rev. by Howard W. Townsend, 240.
Sturtevant, E. H.: *An Introduction to Linguistic Science*. Rev. by John J. Honigman, 386.

Talley, C. Horton (Rev.) *Etiology of Articulatory Speech Defects: A Comparison of the Incidence of Six Selected Factors in Children Having Articulatory Speech Defects with the Incidence of the Same Factors in Children Not Having Speech Defects* (Darrel J. Mase), 395.
Tatman, Clarice (Rev.) *Speech and Human Relations* (Joseph G. Brin), 390.
Temple, William J.: Serviceable Speech in a Democracy, 489.

THEORY OF RHETORIC
Beginnings of a Methodology for Social Control Studies in Public Address. S. Judson Crandell, 36.
John Thelwall: His Life, His School, and His Theory of Education. Frederick W. Haberman, 292.
Lesson in Persuasion. Robert D. Clark, 265.
Letter to the Press: 1778. Leland M. Griffin, 148.
Literature as an Enterprise in Communication. Wilbur Samuel Howell, 417.
Major Factors in the Rhetoric of Historians. Carl B. Cone, 437.
Methodology in the Criticism of Public Address. A. Craig Baird and Lester Thonssen, 134.
Public Address: A Study in Intellectual and Social History. Ernest J. Wrage, 452.
Random Notes on Public Speaking. William Trufant Foster, 139.
Speech in a Communication Course. Glen E. Mills, 40.
Thomas Jefferson and Rhetoric. Eleanor Davidson Berman and E. C. McClintock, Jr., 1.
Tradition of Rhetoric. W. M. Parrish, 464.
Tescher, Donald B. (Rev.) *How To Create Sound Effects for Home Recordings* (Ed Ludes and Hallock B. Hoffman), 538.
Thomas, C. K.: The Place of New York City in American Linguistic Geography, 314.
(Rev.) *General American Speech Sounds* (Grace Barnes), 392.
Thompson, Wayne N.: Contemporary Public Address as a Research Area, 274.
Thonssen, Lester (Rev.) *A Guide to the Practice of International Conferences* (Vladimir D. Pastuhov), 102.
Thonssen, Lester, and A. Craig Baird: Methodology in the Criticism of Public Address, 134.
Thonssen, Lester, and Howard Gilkinson: *Basic Training in Speech.* Rev. by Mildred Freburg Berry, 523.
Tinnea, John W.: A Radio Station Manager to Teachers of Radio, 334.
Townsend, Howard W.: A Veteran Evaluates A Speech Course, 220.
Townsend, Howard W. (Rev.) *Communication Through the Ages* (Alfred Still), 240.
Trepel, Doris, and Mildred Gottdank: A Study of Encephalitics, 355.

Van Riper, C.: *Speech Correction: Principles and Methods.* Rev. by Leon Lassers, 535.

VOICE SCIENCE
Contributions From the Military Programs in Voice Communications. William B. McCoard, 370.
Speech Training Program for Navy Fighter Directors. E. Thayer Curry, 209.